



One Dollar a Year Twenty-five Cents per Copy

The Journal of
**LIBERAL
RELIGION**

This Issue—

Spiritual Mobilization, Incorporated
AN EDITORIAL

Religion and the Whole of Life
By WALLACE W. ROBBINS

Contemporary English Unitarianism
By F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT

Industry's Social Responsibility
By HAROLD P. MARLEY

The Social Conscience of a Church
By HOMER A. JACK

New Service Materials
Edited by VINCENT SILLIMAN

BOOK REVIEWS

Man, by Kenneth L. Patton; An Essay on Man, by Ernst Cassirer; The Road to Serfdom, by Frederick A. Hayek; The Thrill of Tradition, by James Moffatt; Social-Economic Movements, by Harry W. Laidler, and others.

V.7
1945/46

A Special Meadville Edition of

The Journal of

LIBERAL RELIGION

will be issued early this fall.

In addition to the addresses, *Religion and the Whole of Life*, by President Wallace W. Robbins, and *Religion and Preaching Today*, by John Haynes Holmes, it will include signifi-

cant addresses given on the occasion of the Meadville Centennial and the Commencement exercises on June 4, and 5, by James Luther Adams, Frederick May Eliot and Ralph E. Bailey.

Orders for quantities of this special edition may be sent to the Meadville Theological School, Corner Woodlawn and 57th Street, Chicago 37, Illinois.

The Journal of

LIBERAL RELIGION

A national quarterly devoted to creative expression of a faith in keeping with the needs of our modern world. Subscribe today: One year, \$1.00; Three years, \$2.50. Single copies, twenty-five cents plus postage; quantities of ten or more, fifteen cents each, postpaid.

Editor, JOURNAL OF LIBERAL RELIGION,
301 North Mayfield Avenue
Chicago 44, Illinois

Spiritual Mobilization, Incorporated

AN EDITORIAL

The "crusade to preserve free enterprise" in America in the face of a growing popular demand for social responsibility in government was destined from the beginning to be a divisive factor in organized religion as it has long been in organized politics. The National Association of Manufacturers, the Committee for Constitutional Government and lesser organizations—the potentially fascist forces of the nation—have always had their individual spokesmen in the various religious bodies. Now, as active, working groups they have their counterpart in *Spiritual Mobilization*.

Some eight or ten years ago ministers across the land began to receive neatly printed sermons from a large and growing Congregational Church in Los Angeles. In somewhat vague and general terms the sermons dealt with the issues then brought to the fore by the New Deal; and increasingly they attacked all attempts, by federal legislation, to pull the country out of the depression. Eventually the NAM had its attention attracted to the minister of this church, the Rev. James W. Fifield, Jr., and invited him to be its guest speaker at a meeting in New York. He won the confidence of those present, and their vigorous applause, with his glorification of "free enterprise," and he emerged from the meeting with \$50,000 which they enthusiastically contributed to the crusade which he was about to organize. Under such auspices was *Spiritual Mobilization* launched.

In the course of time another minister—from the Atlantic coast in this instance—the Rev. Norman Vincent Peale, of the Marble Collegiate Church of New York City, was drawn into the movement as advisor. Also swelling the list were such formidable names as Dean Emeritus Charles R. Brown of the Yale University Divinity School; Upton Close, NBC radio commentator; Albert W. Hawkes, U. S. Senator from New Jersey, and former Vice-President of the NAM; John A.

Mackay, of the Princeton Theological Seminary; Donald J. Cowling, President of Carlton College, and Roger Babson, nationally known statistician. Sermons, articles and other varieties of propaganda flowed from the presses, financed by Fifield's new friends, and distributed throughout the country. Here at last, it seemed, Protestantism was to give birth to a powerful reactionary movement only thinly disguised by its professed love of freedom and its religious terminology.

Fifield and his Associates

Many of those associated with Fifield and Peale leave no doubt as to their qualifications for the task which Spiritual Mobilization has set for itself. Norman Vincent Peale has until this summer been chairman and chief money-raiser for Frank Gannett's Committee for Constitutional Government. This organization, which has been under congressional investigation, has been called by Representative Wright Patman the most sinister and fascist lobby in Washington. Donald J. Cowling, who now succeeds Fifield as Director of Spiritual Mobilization, has made frequent trips to the Atlantic seaboard seeking large contributions for Carlton College, one of the few important institutions of learning in the Middle West which denies admittance to Negro students. Upton Close is the radio commentator who was recently dropped by one of his sponsors because of his reactionary and fascist utterances over the air. Albert W. Hawkes, former Vice-President of the NAM, was the United States Senator who recently addressed a large audience in Rome and publicly asked a group of American soldiers how they would like to fight against Russia.

Fifield's own association with the NAM has been deliberate and consistent. In 1943, for example, he arranged a meeting for Allan Stockdale, also a Congregational minister, and religious propagandist for the National Association. At that meeting a member of the audience asked Stockdale to explain why the NAM was three times exposed—between 1913 and 1941—by congressional investigations as being “habitually dishonest and deceiving.” Dr. Stockdale did

not explain, but the questioner concluded his statement from the floor with this indictment of James W. Fifield, Jr.:

Dr. Fifield is allowing himself to be maneuvered into a wholly indefensible position by the powerful and insidious pro-fascist interests of the nation. If he continues he will eventually find that he has bartered away his soul if he has not lost ownership of it already.

Fifield has also published a catechism, *What Is This Spiritual Mobilization?* (Bulletin No. 307) in which questions about his purpose and program are answered. Among other questions is this: "Would this movement tend to acquire strange bedfellows?" The answer follows:

It (Spiritual Mobilization) cooperates with every organization or individual that seeks, honorably, to further its objectives. If this includes The League for Constitutional Government, The American Economic Foundation, The Chamber of Commerce, The National Association of Manufacturers, The Republican Party, etc., fine!

The list is revealing. Spiritual Mobilization, branding all and sundry forms of public enterprise "pagan statism," sees no virtue in TVA or the Wagner Act. It will not come forward in support of MVA or a federal plan for full employment, or the Wagner, Murray, Dingell Bill for an extensive program of public health. Social planning is the one cardinal sin, the enemy of all things good and fair, the destroyer of human freedom. Implied in everything the spiritual mobilizers say is the doctrine that collective security and individual liberty are incompatible.

The most charitable comment one can make about this movement is that its indecisiveness and negativism will militate against its effectiveness, and defeat it in the end. It is Fifield's crusade, and Peale's crusade, and Dowling's crusade; but it is not likely that Spiritual Mobilization has infected its "two million" followers with the holy zeal of its promoters. Its literature does not glow with prophetic utterance, nor is it inspired by a love for the common man. Nevertheless, it cannot be dismissed as being unimportant or insignificant any more than Father Coughlin could be dismissed, or Martin Dies or Gerald L. K. Smith. It has great financial resources, and its leaders have demonstrated their ability to tap them.

It also has "respectability," for it speaks in the name of the Christian religion.

Fifield, Cowling, Peale and their fellow-travelers think they are *against* totalitarianism and *for* freedom. They think they are resisting statism. They are mistaken. They are on the side of those very men of power and wealth who would use the state to inflict their economic controls on the people. They are the symptom of the rottenness and decay at the heart of our "Christian" culture. They have lost the human touch. They are not destined to lead the marching hosts to a better world; they are false prophets, and they should be ignored or repudiated precisely as Fifield has already been largely ignored and repudiated by his fellow-Congregationalists in California. Theirs is not the spirit that mobilizes and liberates. Theirs is the spirit which would stifle and immobilize the aspirations of the masses of the people whose real freedom will be achieved only when the government makes *their* concern *its* concern—a responsibility which the contributors to Fifield's and Dowling's and Peale's campaign chest have always renounced when they have considered it at all.

E. T. B.

Religion and the Whole of Life

By WALLACE W. ROBBINS

The address given by the new president of the Meadville Theological School, Chicago, on the occasion of his inauguration, June fifth, 1945.

One of the greatest and most powerfully liberating concepts man has formed in his long history is that of *magic*. Although it has always existed, it was not always possible for man to recognize magic and name it as a force in human life. To the primitive mind magic does not exist; it is not isolated from science and religion but is considered to *be* science and religion. Leaping high over the wheat fields to make the grain grow tall is as realistic as the act of sowing the seed; sticking pins in the wax effigy of the enemy is as real as plunging a spear into his flesh. The primitive mind recognizes no difference; magic and science, superstition and religion, are one. If a sophisticated man tells a primitive man that a regular part of his thought and practice is not related to any objective reality in the universe, but to his own wishful, fearful, faithful self, the primitive man will be mystified.

One sees how great a task it was to discover—much greater still to teach—the difference between fact and fancy, wishful thought and reason. I do not know when magic was first comprehended apart from objective practice, but I know it was an event as far-reaching as the dawn of conscience itself. For the first time came the notion, crude as it was, that there was truth and untruth, and that some real point outside man's subjective desires and will to believe must be found to measure it. Since that time, and up to and including our own, mankind has been engaged in the stupendous effort to apply his great concept and thus discover which of his actions, thoughts and desires are magic, and which are real; how a true point of reference, a real God outside himself, might be known to measure the fundamental truth of existence.

When Aristotle made a distinction between human desires and human needs he was trying to find and apply the concept and discover a truth upon which to found social living. When the high prophets of Israel projected the future in

terms of actual human situations, one world and one mankind, rather than upon the density of smoke from an altar sacrifice, or intuitive feelings evoked in trance, they were voiding magic. When Jesus denied the uses of mechanical obedience to law and ritual, and proclaimed the simple realities that had originated law and ritual, he was driving magic from the temple.

Romanticists wonder whether this excommunication of magic is good; they see in magic the happy childhood dreams of the race, harmlessly beautiful: pretty fairy stories, charming myths, quaint customs, dancing on the village green. It is the romanticists' superstition that dreams are pleasant, and unrealities good. They forget the nightmares, the spectres, the powerful, immoral gods and dark powers of wickedness, the whimsical fates that bind men. They forget that even dancing around the maypole is a happier affair for the child who knows it is play than for the man who must dance because his very life depends upon it.

When Magic Is "Named and Understood"

The romanticist, the artist if you prefer, must come to realize that imagination will not be damned nor play prohibited because it is named and understood. There will be more play and more creative imagination when *it* too is released from the underdrag of magic. The retreat ceases to be a retreat when it becomes a prison. The prison becomes a friendly cubicle when the concept of magic is the key which allows us to pass from work to play, reality to unreality. But let us lose that key and Elysian fields will not be touched with beauty, nor will ploughed fields be capable of sustaining life. The difficulty lies not in reality or unreality, in imagination or truth, but in the confusion of the two. Jesus was clear that when a man asked for a fish he should not be given a serpent, and that when he asked for meat he should not be given a stone.

To single out the primitive man, as I seem to have done, and exclusively damn him for such confusion, is to give a left-handed and wholly undeserved compliment to modern man. Equipped with the accumulated means to distinguish a fish from a serpent, we are in constant peril of confusing the two; for magic remains with us in its most powerful form:

suspended in solution, undetected in our religious culture, waiting to be precipitated out.

For well over this last century of Western history, civilization has been popularly defined in terms of material and mechanisms. If called upon to defend the idea of progress, we turn to a glib recital of our achievements in flight, wireless communication and vision, and important additions to the pharmacopea; we catalogue our attainments in refrigeration, air-conditioning, agriculture, manufacture and distribution. Usually we resent being told that these, while genuine goods, are but the increase in power of either man's gifts of mobility, hearing, talking or seeing, or nature's gifts of food, clothing and shelter. Our resentment springs not from any denial of the worth of such improvement, but from the suggestion that they are not ends in themselves. Have not Marxians faithfully believed that these are ends in themselves? They have tried to evangelize the world with the notion that much good would automatically appear if all men had their full share of these products. Capitalists have defended themselves on the basis that they could put more cars in the garage and more chickens in the pot. To them it appears that there is such powerful magic in the radio that no lying words shall be spoken on it or heard over it. Can it be that modern air-conditioning shall make men more manly than those who warmed their hands by a bundle of burning fagots?

A short time ago an advertising agency, in order to show how large the baby loomed in the paternal heart of a baby-product manufacturer, enlarged a photograph of a baby until it covered a magazine page and, at the same time, this ingenious agency reduced the size of the mother's picture until it was proportionately as small as that of a child. To see the pudgy arms, powerfully clenched fists, and the vacant stare of this monstrous child confronting his adult, intelligent, but pigmy mother, was a fearful sight. In a moment of unreasoning anger this giant could beat his mother to death. So far as I could see, no advantage was revealed here in the mere expansion of bulk and power. It is magic to believe that good resides in a civilization grown powerful in body and lacking in spiritual direction and control.

Others have been aware of this problem, and have proceeded to operate on it by holding to the magical formula that if the answer is not found in bigness, it must be found in its opposite: smallness. If only men could understand the little, they would understand the great. I am not unmoved by the poet's theory that to hold a flower from the crannied wall and understand it, would be to understand man and God, but it is *fallacious*, for all of my response to it. The whole is not comprehended by the sum of all of its parts, much less one of them.

Specialization and the Whole of Life

A short while ago, parsons were delighted with a ready-made illustration for their sermons. A little boy had been given a complicated jig-saw puzzle of a map of the world. In a few minutes he solved it because he had discovered that by assembling the picture of the man on the other side, the world would come out right. Outside of the mechanical difficulties of doing the puzzle through a glass table top while lying on the floor, the little boy was lucky. If the manufacturer of the puzzle had made the picture of the man Hitler, Quisling or Laval, his presumably good, democratic father would have been sure he was swindled.

Specialization and analysis is not in itself a bad thing, but it becomes foolish when it pretends that by understanding or correcting some single part of nature or a single unit of society, the whole of life will become holy. Truth is in it perhaps, but truth that is like a lever without a fulcrum.

Science has given us bulk and power; the pursuit of knowledge has given us intensified information about split-off fragments which stand isolated and without significance. To insist that man's fate shall be served in terms of power is to accept Hegel's statement and a modern state's practice, that "the course of world history stands outside of virtue, blame and justice." To believe that the intensive understanding of the minute will restore wholeness is to isolate knowledge from society as did the European universities at the advent of political tyranny. Both these modern magical practices threaten us now. As we stand on the eve of military victory, no clear purpose other than that of the physical extension of

power, sufficient to put down military insurrection, or the hopeless return to an indefatigable examination of isolated phenomena, appears to lead the world towards a realistic, dynamic peace. Both these ways have failed before. If man is doomed to failure, he could at least avoid the inevitable boredom that results from making the same mistakes over and over again.

The religious brotherhood of men throughout the world is the final hope that there are purposes true enough and compelling enough to *include* power and minute knowledge, yet *overreach* them. Not until such religious purposes appear to man will there be any moral willingness to make work *whatever* mechanics may be produced by successive conferences of nations. Further, it will be impossible to build so much as a domestic political economy until we are able to state for it a purpose that goes beyond personal profit or national aggrandisement. Finally, the personal sanity and the spiritual health of man shall never be realized until a measurement of human destiny is known to be larger than that of the wishful ego of the individual.

To shake magic out of the ways of man, and give to him a realistic religion, is our chief task today. Of course it is an ancient one, but in our time it has a new twist. Where formerly primitive man felt that his method was good if its purpose was, we have concluded that our method is good, if it has *no* purpose other than that of the exercise involved in the method itself.

Activism Devoid of Purpose

This activism has tended to take possession of our churches. It is generally believed that educational methods will fill church schools, methods of calling will make parish calls good, methods of collecting will make for a sincere offering, methods of young people's work will develop young people. In the minister's study telephones are dialed and answered, new techniques of worship are invented. Everyone is busy, so busy that one is reminded of Henry Adams' report of the mediaeval tumbler in *Mont Saint Michel and Chartres*. This poor fellow joined a monastic order and, unable to do anything else, paid his respects to the Virgin by

tumbling, leaping, spinning and walking on his hands before the statue of the Holy Mother. When the abbot came to spy on him, he saw the poor wretch lying exhausted and senseless in the nave, with Mary, the Mother of God, fanning him with a kerchief in the apparent hope that he could be brought back to consciousness.

Something like Mary's solicitude needs to be exercised today upon our well-intentioned but exhausting church activity, if ever religious leadership is to take this age out of its wanderings to and fro, just outside the borders of the Promised Land. It is my confidence that the theological schools have it in their power to restore the church to her senses and establish upon her the full responsibility to discover and courageously publish the goals of our common pilgrimage. Upon the theological school rests the necessity to raise up leaders, not only blessed with the natural gifts of manliness and skill, but unswerving and dedicated in their purpose.

But, in carrying out her charge, the theological school is not herself unencumbered with magic notions and devices, and she is handicapped still further by being caught between college beneath her and church demands over her.

As to the magic within her, there is still the prevailing notion that a student should try to drop his pin ball into various grooves of courses and studies and that that, if successfully done, will all add up automatically and light up the whole board. There is no magical quality in mere familiarity with the Bible, church history, the history of religious thought, the techniques of religious education, pastoral work, community relations and preaching, if a clear goal is not in them. For too long have we assumed that discipline without purpose is in itself good. We need to put our purpose first and our discipline afterward.

Fragmentariness in Education

Colleges send up to the theological school minds well filled with a miscellaneous collection of information about Bunsen burners, periodic tables, decisive battles, Shakespeare's plays, knee-jerks, sociological folk-lore, and an ability to translate six pages of *M. Perichon* in two hours. Usually the college has not given the student any comprehen-

sion, much less mastery, of the basic English sentence. The only relation the poor student can see between his various bits of knowledge is that they were required of him for graduation. Since this confusion has gone on for twelve years below the college level it is well set, and it becomes very painful to try to think and live theologically instead of chaotically.

Churches stand above the theological schools, often inflicting doctrinal tests upon teachers and students, imposing an authority that kills a free search for the meaning and purpose which alone can enable them to carry out their true mission.

Fortunately this last difficulty has never plagued The Meadville Theological School. Founded by Unitarians over one hundred years ago, freedom from doctrinal tests of either students or faculty was written into her charter and, better yet, has been carefully guarded by generation after generation of trustees and free churchmen. Now associated with other great schools in the Federated Theological Faculty of the University of Chicago, which have developed their own independence, there is every good reason for rejoicing in the fact of a reinforced and powered search for truth, unhampered by prejudice and restraint.

This free search is reinforced and powered because it brings together the largest aggregation of capital, faculty, library facilities and students that exist anywhere today on this continent. Here we have not only a plain fact over which to rejoice, but a condition fraught with such untrammelled power as to be sobering. Unless we succeed realistically in fulfilling the responsibilities such strength and such freedom allow, we shall be properly damned or sadly pitied for generations to come. If, on the other hand, we do succeed, it will be a decisive victory of such great proportions that no greater honor may be spoken of man than to say, he stood with us in the darkest hour, and at last saw the streaking lights of dawn. Before us is the greatest century of man: a time when the great natural powers released by science, and the great social powers released by political mechanism and the renaissance of the ancient cultures of the Colored East,

together, must be brought into that dynamic harmony which will grant an intensified freedom and a new security for man's body and his soul. The idols of superstition born of ignorance and despair must be torn down that God may visit men. In ways that our friends who stand on street corners distributing pamphlets about the millenium may not know, we are indeed standing at the end of a world and with travail awaiting the new.

The labor before us is very great. We must give significance to the fragmented learning the student brings with him from college, gathering the scattered grain into bread. We must become disenthralled from the outmoded disciplines of a theological education, from its magic books, words, and rituals, that the basic realities shall be made plain. We must take calculated risks and make daring explorations of man's and God's nature. We must find fresh dedication, produce an enriched piety, develop a philosophy of religion that will not exclude the races, nations and varied religious aspirations of men throughout the earth. At last we must grasp with determined hands and sure strength the bell rope of prophecy and cause earth-dwellers to assemble to the tolling clangor that shall signal the beginning of the worship of that which has formerly stood within the shadows and now is bright with peace.

Ah, but this is anticipation. For these days ahead we shall know only that the hard training of months is consumed in minutes of action, that most of warfare is waiting, that most of victory is not to lose heart when you stand alone. Discipline, patience and courage must be our watchwords. Many failures, many heartaches, much loneliness, will be our pay. Yet better men than we have brought us to this place: saints, missionaries and prophets have given us our moral capital and such venturesomeness as will not rest, except it rest in God.

Let us have confidence in one another, pleasure in our comradeship, pride in our banners. Together we shall march to the ends of the earth and, having defeated the works of darkness, rim this great globe of space with light and the peace of holiness and of God.

Contemporary English Unitarianism

By F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT

A distinguished minister and author sketches the status of Unitarianism in England today, and suggests its role in the post-war days of theological and social reconstruction.

A few years ago, writing in his volumes on contemporary theology in Great Britain and America, Professor W. M. Horton pointed out that Barthianism had not penetrated England and America to the same degree that it had come to occupy on the theological stage in Scotland and on the Continent. At the time of which Professor Horton was writing, reaction against a prevailing liberalism in theology had not gone very far in these two countries. In England the interests of a Unitarian theology have always tended to be directed by the prevailing assertions of orthodoxy. During the middle years of the last century, for example, orthodoxy was deeply interested in retaining the older Biblicism in face of the rising tide of historical criticism and of challenge from the physical sciences.

For the Unitarian, these issues were forces to be investigated and understood. Even among the more conservative groups there was a willingness to accept a critical position and to set forth a way of faith not imperilled when literalism is overthrown. In the same way the Romantic Revival was to prove a challenge to former approaches to religious faith. In the hands of Schlegel and Coleridge it pointed the way back to an assertion of traditional Christian dogmas. But it could likewise suggest that the final authority in religion is to be found in human experience rather than in either book or creed. Accordingly, the Romantic Revival proved to be the means of escape from literalism for Channing and Parker in America as for Martineau and J. J. Tayler in England. A Unitarianism gradually emerged which was in accord with the universalistic spirit of Parker. Claiming to be within the general Christian tradition, it did not claim finality for any one version of Christianity. It tended to be Christocentric without being Christological. There was a readiness to admit an element of the unknowable into the

ideas of God and of eternity. The position of E. M. Geldart, Philip Wicksteed, and other well-known Unitarian leaders marked out an approach to theology and its problems which saw the attainment of glimpses of final truth as possible by means of debate and investigation carried on within an atmosphere of toleration. As an ethical sequel, there was a turning to humanitarianism with its gospel of progress and of hope for the salvation of man through human effort. As many of the tendencies in the more orthodox churches were also in a liberal direction, Unitarianism was apt to regard itself as cooperating with "modernism" and with liberal theology generally rather than looking upon its distinctive contribution in terms of specialized reaction against the more orthodox churches and theologies.

The Returning Tide of Orthodoxy

During recent years, this situation has changed very considerably. Since Professor Horton wrote his books orthodoxy has become more assertive and there has been a widespread return to authoritarianism. Roman Catholicism has urged the need for an acceptance of the universal church, possessing authority over mankind as the sole means of salvation from the turmoils of contemporary disintegration. It is too often overlooked that the Roman Catholic Church stands for more than this general idea. It insists upon basing its claims on a fundamentalist view of the Bible and an interpretation of church history which has been riddled through and through by accepted historians.

If he were writing to-day, Professor Horton would not be able to diminish the effects of Barthianism in England. Among Protestants, the return to Geneva has characterized the writings of Dr. J. S. Whale and various other leaders. Even where Barth is not fully accepted Reinhold Niebuhr has taught his readers to combine a radical approach to economic and social questions with an authoritarian and neo-orthodox view of religion. In his insistence upon the absoluteness of God and the worthlessness of man to achieve moral perfection, Niebuhr's theology has the result of producing a form of mitigated Barthianism. If Unitarianism is to survive this return to authoritarianism, it can only be in

terms of the setting forth of a coherent theology which provides answer to prevailing orthodox tendencies.

Certainly, at the present time, contemporary British Unitarianism is in need of looking to its resources. Over the last twenty years it has not made the headway which should be demanded of it. It has produced a few prominent thinkers whose philosophy is a challenge to authoritarian or totalitarian methods and who have sought to inculcate faith in the worth of the individual man. Of these, Dr. L. P. Jacks is probably the most notable figure. Within Biblical criticism there has been a tendency to fall back upon the works of contemporary Continental scholars such as Loisy and Guignebert; there has been no return to the palmy days of James Drummond or of Dr. Estlin Carpenter. The late Principal of the Unitarian College, Manchester, Dr. Herbert McLachlan, contributed some important writing on St. Luke but it revealed strong conservative tendencies. Historical studies have claimed some Unitarians and authoritative work has been done in particular fields, such as Dr. McLachlan's writings on the history of dissenting education, or those of Principal R. V. Holt on the Unitarian place in social and philanthropic progress. Perhaps it is true to say that too many official English Unitarian publications are in the form of pamphlets and that not enough attention has been given to the production of larger works. At the present time, a report is to be issued shortly upon doctrine, embodying the results reached by some of the younger ministers in a series of conferences. A new series of pamphlets under the editorship of Principal Holt has undertaken to provide the public with Unitarian statements concerning contemporary problems in a series of short essays. The practical difficulties lie in the fact that English Unitarianism is a relatively small movement numerically and that its resources are therefore limited. Many of its ministers are busily engaged in the institutional work of the ministry and have little time for writing or for the teaching of a wider public. This fact is illustrative of a weakness which post-war planning should seek to overcome.

In the world of today the full force of reaction, theological and political, is arising in England. Unitarianism, like every

other viewpoint, is suffering from the effects of a contemporary disintegration of values revealed by such movements as surrealism in art or in an utter pessimism in sociology. Yet, the challenge of orthodoxy is proving beneficial to Unitarian thinking. Exclusion from ecclesiastical association with orthodox Christians has the good effect of teaching Unitarians to understand and explore their own intrinsic viewpoint. At the same time there is a tendency on the part of some to look to the past matched by a tendency, seen in others, to seek to build for the future. This antithesis is simply the Unitarian version of a disintegrating tendency which appears at the moment in every department of culture. In general, it is having the effect of parting Unitarian thought into three groups, each of which has prominent representation within the British scene.

The older Christocentric Unitarianism has its present-day representatives. In general their assertion is that the truth of religion is summed up finally in the figure of Jesus of Nazareth who in his own person embodied a divine moral revelation. The biblical literature calls for an exalted respect given to none other as setting forth his story. Yet, examination of the original records leaves no place for the orthodox doctrine of the Deity of Christ. This viewpoint represents the attitude of those nineteenth century Unitarians who were more than a little disturbed by Dr. Martineau and who clung to a Biblical outlook which he was doing so much to undermine. The position is simply that of an anti-trinitarian Christianity. At the present time it has been badly worsted in the attacks of contemporary New Testament scholarship. The work of the Form Critics has pointed out that the Gospels are not biographical; they are the content of early Christian preaching. Among others, Loisy and Guignebert have shown the extent to which myth and legend have entered into their records. Accordingly, it is possible to make the reply that too little is known about Jesus to make the confident assertions of the older Unitarians concerning his place as moral leader. An over-emphasis upon the Biblical literature can only lead to a distorted vision of world-religion. Writers such as Channing did a yeoman

service in the liberation of thought by breaking through the crust of a hard Calvinism, but their conclusions could not be final. In general, the Unitarian traditionalist is in a difficult position. His liberalism is challenged very widely upon the social side, and his theological claims will not bear critical examination. There is every likelihood that he will find himself more at home within the liberal wing of the orthodox churches, where his positive affirmations are accepted without question, a fact which may explain the relapse of a few younger ministers of this school into the Episcopal Church.

The Influence of Theodore Parker

Far more popular in contemporary English Unitarianism is the attitude of Christian universalism which follows upon the teaching of Theodore Parker a century ago. Christianity is ploughed into the soil of the West and probably represents the highest form of religion through its gospel of love. But it is not to be restricted and hedged about by claims to exclusiveness. Every great religion represents a valid intuition in the way of faith, and God is to be sought through all. Religion tends to become mysticism in brotherhood and stands in opposition to the dogmatism or sectarian exclusiveness of the theological or ecclesiastical authoritarians. Among Unitarians of this type, it is customary to use hymns and prayer within which the name of Jesus secures high recognition, but it is linked with support for such work as that of the universalistic educational mission conducted in India by the Rev. Margaret Barr.

In many ways, this position is an extension of the attitude of Martineau or Tayler into the modern world, and would certainly have had the loyalty of such typical Unitarian figures as Charles Beard, the historian, or R. A. Armstrong. Its difficulty lies in the place which it seeks to give to supernaturalism in theology. A strong theism tends to demand some form of accommodation with the older supernaturalism. The importance of the present reaction, as headed by such figures as Nathaniel Micklem or J. S. Whale, is seen in the extent to which it points out that views of God and of the universe which are supernaturalistic in the last resort demand the traditional theology for their completion;

whatever criticisms may be levelled against Jacques Mar-tain and the Neo-Thomist revival, it is certainly not lacking in logic and deduction. Yet, if synthesis be sought with the wider liberal culture of the present time, as it is represented by Julian Huxley, Kirsopp Lake and others, there can be no place for supernaturalism of the older type, and its lack tends to weaken the more traditionalist aspects of theism. Perhaps the next great issue which Unitarianism in England will have to face is that of the extent to which it is bound up with the older theistic hypothesis and the extent to which it can accommodate restatement in this aspect of its world-view.

The Approaching Humanist Controversy

This issue is occupying the minds of those Unitarians who form the third group. As yet an ethical humanism is not a very common gospel in English Unitarian pulpits, but there are signs that it is on the increase. It is faced with the fact that the great modern revolution has been *away from* the traditional view of God as first cause and *to one* which says with Descartes, "I think, therefore I am." In the sense that it sees man as the highest point of creation, it is definitely and emphatically humanist. At the same time, it makes the claim that the stream of life is not a mere stream, meaning on, but that it has direction and purpose. Most Unitarians of this type would find a close sympathy with Bernard Shaw and his view of the life-force as the revelation of the final causation of life which forms the only deity that modern man can know. But, again, it makes the claim that this stream of life reveals moral value and represents life as sparkling with moral quality. A mysticism which accepts the idea of the Good, which seeks to attain it, and which demands a constant communion with it, is a logical sequel and forms the basis of religion. Humanism, in this sense, is not anti-theistic of necessity; it seeks to find some place for those valid emotions and aspirations which the traditional theistic beliefs sought to protect. But it demands that these beliefs should be restated in a manner which brings them into full accord with modern scientific knowledge and which makes them relevant to the highest levels of contem-

porary experience. It therefore seeks its Deity, its Moral Ideal, within human life and not outside it. So far, there has been no outstanding humanist controversy, such as convulsed American Unitarianism before the war, but this does not mean that a time will not approach when the issues of that controversy will have to be faced in England.*

It is natural that there should be a quickening of sociological interests among contemporary Unitarians. The social issues of today are those which have come to the fore at a time when the old individualistic economics of an unplanned society have broken down hopelessly. A progressive Unitarianism can bring to the discussion a freshening sense of moral idealism. It is not without significance that, in some quarters, there is a tendency to accept the Marxist analysis and to apply it to those fields with which it is the especial province of religion to deal. Again, the war has brought to a head discussions of pacifism and internationalism in a manner which suggests that they cannot be overlooked again within Unitarian circles. Questions of the need for a planned society are clearly related to the issues of a free religious faith. The resulting lesson is that Unitarianism cannot afford to carry its individualism of criticism and opinion over into fields of social action. It is bound up of necessity with efforts to secure social rejuvenation in a manner which implies the planning of industrial society. Unitarianism is essentially a democratic faith and it has the task of interpreting the high poise which it gives to personal faith into the religious beliefs most suited to a modern industrial democracy. The next great step which it must undertake in its theological evolution is to relate its religious position to social as well as to individual ends. In short, it must answer Reinhold Niebuhr and his school by vindicating anew the part to be played by the natural man within the process of social and political redemption.

English Unitarianism certainly suffers from smallness of numbers, limited resources and fewness of churches and

*Perhaps the present writer may be permitted to mention that his book, *Religion To-Morrow* (London, Lindsey Press, 1943), and his lecture, *Rationalism and Culture* (London, Watts & Co., 1944), were written from this viewpoint as a contribution to the attempts made to bring English Unitarianism into line with the wider humanist movement.

colleges. But in the past it has been able to show that its pulpits could be the home of a liberal progressive thought allied to the life and spirit of the times. At the period of the French Revolution it was the small band of English Unitarians who were outstanding in their welcome for the new political principles. The association of the name of Dr. Wickstead with the work of the Fabian Society, with Shaw and Ibsen, with Dante, and with political economy, shows him to have been a man whose interests were closely allied with the wider spirit pervading the period of Havelock Ellis or Edward Carpenter. At the present time Unitarianism in England needs to recover a position where its pulpits can afford a home for the highest levels of contemporary thought, unbounded by creed or dogma. It needs to work out to the full the proposition that, whilst faith remains constant through the ages as an orientation of personality, religious beliefs have changed notoriously and will doubtless change again. Its three fundamentals lie in the nature of Deity, the conception of commonwealth, and the sense of eternity as transcending time. Each of these fundamentals calls for redefinition into the thought-forms justified by present levels of knowledge and experience. Deity needs restatement as life-force, within the conception of commonwealth lies the whole of present conflict concerning the nature of the state and of society, whilst eternity demands redefinition in terms of moral valuation. In short, contemporary Unitarianism calls for the evolution of a distinctive cultural attitude of standards of criticism and assessment which can give to it an intrinsic place within the shaping of the emerging civilization. Unless it can achieve this end, it will be in danger of becoming vague and of losing a clear-cut reason for existence as a distinctive movement. Perhaps it may be suggested in this connection that little or nothing is to be gained by associating the Unitarian movement with various orthodox and semi-orthodox bodies, such as the British Council of Churches and its local equivalents. The presuppositions of a modern-minded Unitarianism and of the prevailing temper within latter-day orthodoxy stand in absolute opposition concerning their psychology of man.

Unitarianism, in order to fulfil its purposes, would do better to seek alliances with a wider humanistic culture, such as that of the rationalists and of the ethicists.

Present-day attacks upon the Unitarian position very largely take the form of attacks upon liberalism as a whole. Ideas of the worth of man and of moral progress need to be reestablished in our world or liberalism will die inevitably. Its alternatives are variant forms of totalitarianism which would cloak the individual conscience within a general attempt to standardize opinion. In England this onslaught upon liberalism is in full play. Within the religious field it secures a constant support from the Religious Advisory Committee of the British Broadcasting Company which will not broadcast any religious programme not standing "in the mainstream of the Christian tradition," that is to say not recording the ancient presuppositions of the orthodox churches. The new Education Bill of 1944 provides a dangerous precedent by abandoning any pretense of secular education and by making it possible to use the state-aided schools as forcing-houses for the orthodox churches. These trends are illustrative of the contemporary onslaught against the liberal spirit which, in its most extreme form, is to be seen in Hitler. In part, it has arisen out of the depression which overtook the inter-war world when faced with international breakdown. Circumstance has necessitated that older gospels of progress must be thought out anew; man may progress but he is also capable of vast moral relapses. Yet it may be questioned how far depression and upheaval have really undermined the characteristic liberal virtues of nationality and liberality. Unitarianism in the England of today can find its opportunity in the extent to which these values are still capable of being built up into a humanism which can seek, on the one hand, to understand man and, on the other, to retain those values implicit in the individual reaction of his fundamental personality to the whole universe which creates personal religion in its deepest meaning.

Preaching and Religion Today

By JOHN HAYNES HOLMES

The distinguished minister of the Community Church, New York, summarizes his philosophy of preaching at the centennial celebration of the Meadville Theological School.

My first duty this evening is to congratulate the Meadville Theological School on this occasion, which marks the one hundredth anniversary of its founding.

My second duty is to thank the president, the trustees, and the faculty of this school, for the invitation which has brought me here to address this congregation.

To all this I must add my feeling of unutterable satisfaction that I have been asked to speak about my trade—to talk on preaching in relation to certain tendencies of religion in these times. For I believe that preaching needs vindication. I would defend it, dignify it, exalt it. I would argue that religion must die without its prophets. Preaching is the language of the soul. It is the lips of man enkindled by a live coal from off the altar. It is the voice of one crying in the wilderness, "Prepare ye the way of the Lord." In its true estate it is the noblest of the arts; in its highest use it is the salvation of mankind. From Jesus's *Sermon on the Mount* to Gandhi's *Sermon by the Sea*, it is the testament of God. Yet it is held today in neglect, oftentimes contempt; and even when respected and heeded, has but remnants of its old authority.

There are forces in our time that are eating away at preaching, as termites eat away at the foundations of a building. There are tendencies in this age that ebb and flow away from preaching, as an ocean tide flows away from a ship and leaves it stranded upon the shore. Things trivial and momentous combine in mutual conspiracy to still the voice of religion.

The multiplicity of interests, for example, that press upon us — the hectic pace at which we move — the crowded hours in which we wake! There was a time when religion was the central concern of life, and the sermon the chief utter-

ance of man. Those were the days when the minister took an hour-glass into his pulpit, and at the end of the first hour turned it over to begin the second. Channing's *Baltimore Sermon* ran to more than twelve thousand words, and must have taken at least an hour and forty minutes to deliver. When Daniel Webster died, Theodore Parker preached a sermon that lasted two hours and three-quarters to a congregation that forgot their Sunday dinners. There was time, in those days, for a preacher to turn around, to develop his theme, to adorn his periods, to unfold his vision. A sermon could be a masterpiece, like a Raphael Madonna or a Beethoven symphony. But now we are overwhelmed by interests clamoring for our attention. We are restless, distracted and impatient. When I began my ministry in New York, Sunday was still a day set apart for religious services and sermons. In a period of forty years I have seen the day beset by the automobile, the movie, the radio, golf, baseball, symphony concerts and recitals, and the institution of the out-of-town week-end. If it is to be gotten in at all, the Sunday service must be short, and the sermon shorter. The radio shows the trend. When Dr. Cadman began his broadcasting he was allowed an hour; Dr. Fosdick is now cut down to a scant fifteen minutes for his discourse. As a result most sermons are picayune affairs — pleasant little essays, or diversions of thought. A real sermon should be organized like a military campaign into an enemy's country, with an array of ideas "as terrible as an army with banners." Instead we are getting sermons that are like picnics into a nearby countryside for innocent exercise and play. A brief excursion, and they are over!

Not that I would arbitrarily test a sermon by its duration—the very thing that is done, by the way, in advocating the short sermon in contrast to the long—as though brevity itself constituted merit apart from content and style! Thus are we constantly reminded of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address and his Second Inaugural, as though he had never spoken his full-length First Inaugural, his extended Cooper Union Address, and his hours-long debates with Stephen Douglas. What I am insisting is that you can't bind the sermon in a chronologi-

cal strait-jacket, and expect it to be free and mighty. You can't breed to pygmies, and produce giants. There is such a thing as putting the pure essence of thought into small compass, but this is no more preaching than a golden statuette by Benvenuto Cellini is sculpture. Phillips Brooks called it painting on ivory as contrasted with frescoing the walls of chapel or cathedral. It is usually a petty idea that is presented in a petty period of time. A sermon, if worthy of itself, must have range and scope, as well as depth and height. It must expand to the measure of its appointed themes of God, immortality, and the soul. The quality which Phillips Brooks found most lacking in the sermons of his time was "breadth." And by "breadth" he said he did not mean "tolerance of opinion or anything of that kind, [but] largeness of movement, the great utterance of great truths, the great enforcement of great duties as distinct from the minute, the subtle, and ingenious treatment of little topics, side issues of the soul's life." But great sermons of this type cannot be confined within the conventional fifteen or twenty minutes of the present day. A heavenly discourse must have what Schubert gave his C-major symphony, "a heavenly length."

On "Going Over the Hour"

Not every man can be a great preacher, but all men can strive to attain to their tallest stature. They can be encouraged to stretch their muscles, to enlarge their minds, "to enlarge the place of their tents." The theological student should be trained to think big thoughts and to develop them along big lines to big ends. The preacher should mount his pulpit on Sunday morning prepared to wrestle not with time but with eternity. As for the church, it should have enough dignity, self-respect and faith to give its minister full opportunity to use his strength, like a bird its wings, in sustained flights through the very firmament of thought. I am a poor college preacher because, among other things, I can never adapt myself to a chapel service which must be not more than an hour long. To tell a preacher who begins to speak at 11:30, that he must cease at 11:55 is an insult to the man and an outrage upon his sermon. I am

trained, by the custom of many years, to preach an hour, or until I'm done. If I go over the hour my congregation thinks that I am in particularly fine form. If I fall short of the hour, and stop at forty or forty-five minutes, they fear that I am ill, or perhaps entering at last upon that period of decline which cannot now be far away. This, I may say, is the tradition of my church. The sermon, glorified through a century by such preachers as Orville G. Dewey, George H. Hepworth, Robert Collyer, and Minot J. Savage, is sought with eagerness and received with reverence.

A second unfortunate influence upon preaching these days is the change which has come over our style of public speaking. I can think of no cause for this transformation except that of science, which has taught us to magnify reason at the expense of emotion. There must be no feeling in our use of thought these days, lest we be unfaithful to the scientific spirit. We must be cool, calm, objective, unmoved by any personal enthusiasm, or even concern, least of all by any divine frenzy. Otherwise we shall not have that attitude of pure disinterestedness which can alone reveal to us reality. This has induced us to a type of public speaking which is at the opposite pole from passion, which Jonathan Swift described as the secret of all noble utterance. Passion is the last thing we want today. Our thought must not blaze like fire lest it consume the truth. Rather must it congeal like ice that it may preserve the truth. The outstanding exponent of this contemporary form of address in my time was Charles William Eliot, the distinguished President of Harvard University. His speeches were the acme of clarity, simplicity and dignity. Conveyed by a voice of extraordinarily beautiful timbre, and objectified by a person of august stature, his words had an enormous impressiveness and power. But they were as cold as an arctic sea, and as bare as a stretch of desert.

Eloquence Over the Radio

And now comes the radio to make man a part of a machine for the projection of the human voice over the vast spaces of the air! What kind of eloquence is it that can be

poured into a microphone or a loud speaker? How much feeling is kindled in the breast of an orator who sees no audience and knows no reaction of soul to soul? That broadcasting has an art of its own, I have no doubt. What this art may be was shown by President Roosevelt in broadcasts that marked a new epoch in the history of human communication. But this art is no more the art of public speech than the radio drama is the art of histrionics. Which means that a blight is spreading over contemporary speaking which, caught in the tentacles of the radio, is in process of being squeezed of its veritable life-blood! What was once the fine art of oratory is fast becoming the routine trade of commentation.

I plead, in the case of preaching, for a recovery of that form of elevated speech which will touch the dry bones of reason with prophetic passion, and make them live again. Let us revivify the transcendent tradition of St. Chrysostom, St. Bernard, Bossuet, Whitefield, Chalmers, Newman, Robertson, and Theodore Parker. Preaching, said Phillips Brooks, in his *Lectures on Preaching*, is a compound of truth and personality. But personality also is a compound. In its highest estate it is far more than any mere exercise of reason. It includes all the attributes of man's being, physical as well as psychological or spiritual. Think of Phillips Brooks and what it took to make him the supreme preacher of the last half of the last century. A magnificent physique, a commanding presence, a countenance radiant with inward beauty, a voice that rang with celestial tones, a torrent of eloquent speech, unquenchable, uncontrollable, which poured from his lips like a freshet from a living spring! Think of putting this man behind a microphone! The preacher, you say, must speak calmly, quietly, dispassionately? Who do you think this preacher is? A reporter, merely, who gives us facts in serene and pleasant voice? Not if he remembers and responds to the call of his ordination. The true preacher is an advocate who defends great causes of human need; he is an artist who depicts with glowing colors the beauty of holiness; he is a minstrel who sings songs of the soul's melody; he is a seer

who reveals reality seen only "in the mind's eye"; he is a messenger who comes from afar to bring the good news of the kingdom. These are the parts that he must play, and, if he is to play them effectively, he must command the language, the color, the music, the inspiration of them all. I say there is a tongue, a manner, a style, a form of expression through voice, mien, and inward energy, which are the preacher's own. These cannot be reduced to the calm cadence of mere reason. It is not enough for the sermon to follow, with whatsoever precision, a line of thought. It must soar and sing — catch a vision and disclose it to other men. There is a story told of Henry Ward Beecher who on a certain occasion ended his discourse with a spontaneous and eloquent description of an angel keeping watch on the ramparts of heaven, clad in splendor, and holding in his hand a spear, tipped with a silver star. "How did you ever think of that star?" asked a listener, after the service. "I didn't think of it," said Beecher, "I saw it."

Great Literature and Great Preaching

Why are we getting so little ecstatic speech of this kind in our pulpits today? What has become of "rapt Isaiah's wild seraphic fire"? The times are all against such utterance, it is true. But are the theological schools doing all they can to kindle and nurse the flame? What might it not mean if these schools led their students deliberately along the heights of great oratory, from Demosthenes and Cicero to Daniel Webster and John Bright, and thus acquainted them at first hand with the art of homiletical mountaineering? Why should there not be courses in great literature, so that the students might become as familiar with Virgil, Dante, Shakespeare and Milton, as with Thomas Aquinas, John Calvin, and Schleiermacher? What could be wiser or more profitable, than for the years of theological study to be accompanied by stern disciplines of the spirit, so that the students might be led to those mystic realms where may be found the gift of tongues? The restoration of great religion waits upon the restoration of great preaching. The preacher, let us remember, in the Emersonian

phrase, is "a bard of the Holy Ghost." Is it not the first duty of the school to take this "bard" while he is still "new-born," and lead him to sacred altars, where live coals may be lifted, and laid upon his lips?

A third unfortunate influence upon preaching these days springs from what we have learned to call the social applications of Christianity. The church is no longer merely a pulpit for preaching and an altar for worship, but is become an institution for the conduct of good works in the community. The minister is not only a prophet and a priest, but is now supposed to be an executive, an administrator, a director of public enterprises, a member of committees and social agencies, a leader of various political and economic reforms — an active servant of society as well as of the church. The sermon, now only one of many functions, hardly more than a by-product of community life, has inevitably and in some cases deplorably suffered.

To many of you it will be a surprise that I should thus speak of socialized Christianity as intruding upon preaching, when I have all my life been an advocate of this interpretation of Jesus's Gospel, and am more than ever such an advocate today. But it is just because I have tried so hard to apply my religion as well as to preach it, that I have become so acutely conscious of the conflict between these two endeavors.

It was preaching that took me into the ministry. Since I can remember I have existed under the spell of words, as others have existed under the spell of music or design, and I have yearned to exercise this spell upon mankind. Now at the very time that I entered the divinity school, there came what has been called the social awakening of the churches. The influence of William Ellery Channing and Theodore Parker was already strong upon me, but now came the giants of my own day — Edward Everett Hale, Francis G. Peabody, Washington Gladden, Josiah Strong, Edward R. Ross, and that heroic prophet and saintly man, Walter Rauschenbusch, and his great book, *Christianity and the Social Crisis*. I emerged from Harvard all aflame with social passion — still yearning to preach, but deter-

mined to make my preaching an agent for the reform of the social order, the abolition of the twin evils of poverty and war. It was not long before I discovered what a drain upon my time and strength was active service in the community, or even a mere interest in social questions. I began my ministry with the determination to be a scholar, for preaching must have its roots in scholarship. I remembered fondly the story of old Dr. Nathaniel Emmons, the famous Puritan divine of the 18th century — how, when he died, it was found that the legs of his desk-chair had so worn themselves into the floor of his study, that the chair could not be moved, but had to be lifted out of the holes which had been dug through the years by Emmons's prolonged pursuit of learning. But my scholarly ambitions departed early — and I am scandalized by the superficial materials of knowledge hastily gathered and thrown together in my sermons. I have dreamed for years of being a great preacher in the great tradition — and it saddens and almost sickens me to think of the Sundays scattered through my life when I have climbed into my pulpit with a sermon half-prepared, a body almost too tired to stand, and a mind too confused and distraught to be focussed upon the business of the hour. If I had not had the gift of *ex tempore* speech, I wonder how long I would have survived! Now, when my work is all but done, and I have left only a few scant years of waning energy, I dream, as Charles Lamb dreamed of his children that were never born, of the sermons I might have preached, of the hymns I might have written, of the books I might have published, had I not given the best strength of my life to social causes. Was I wise or foolish in doing what I did?

When Preaching Becomes a Specialty

Of course, the time will come when the church will select and specialize its ministers. The great work of public service will be in the hands of men adapted to and trained for this particular function. As for preachers, they will be protected in their sacred calling. The Protestant churches will take example of the great Catholic Church, and when they find a preacher, will set him aside for the

work of prophecy, and nothing else. You know how Rome has preaching orders to which the men with high gifts of speech and spirit are consigned, that they may not be worn out by parochial duties, ecclesiastical offices and social activities in the community, but dedicated utterly to what is chosen for them as the mission of their lives. Rome is too wise to be fooled by the sentimental delusion that a preacher must exhaust himself in human contacts in order to have living material for his sermons. This is a mere manufactured excuse for making the minister a helpless and hopeless man of all work. But some day the Protestant churches will wake up and conserve their preachers for their own appointed calling. The Riverside Church in New York is wise enough to ask and expect its distinguished minister, Dr. Fosdick, to do this one thing, namely, preach. Meanwhile, failing this, the preachers in our churches must conserve themselves as best they can. If we wonder sometimes why it is, under the circumstances of this busy world and crowded life, that preaching in our Protestant churches is so often of a high order, I am convinced it is because the preachers are more and more learning to establish their own conditions of protection. Years ago I discovered, in my own modest case, that if my preaching was not to collapse utterly, I must deliberately, even ruthlessly, hedge myself about with impassable barriers. It is now two decades and more since I received any callers at my study except by special appointment. Certain hours of the day are mine, not to be intruded upon by anybody. Two evenings of each week at least I must have at home for rest, recreation, and quiet. Saturday is a day sacred to myself, as Sunday is a day sacred to my people. With rare and unusual exceptions, I see nobody, I answer no telephone calls, I accept no engagements, I stay rigorously at home, and in these latter years I spend a good part of the day in bed. All this may sound silly, self-conscious, self-important. Why should a preacher take himself so seriously? To which question the answer is obvious — that he must first take himself seriously if anybody else is ever to take him seriously! If he is to “run the race that is set before [him],” and “finish the course,” then, like an athlete, he

must be in training. Such training, in body, mind, and spirit, is a life-job.

Are there other obstacles in the path of preaching these days? There are! One takes us deeper into life than we have yet gone — into the field of ethics and the problem of the relativity of morals.

“When There Were Absolutes in Human Life”

One of the amazing phenomena of our time is the fading, even in some places the disappearance, of our moral sensibilities. The liquidation of standards, the deflation of values! I can remember the time, strange as it may seem, when there were absolutes in human life, like fixed stars in the firmament. These absolutes — or *the* absolute, as it was called — concerned fundamentally the eternal distinction between right and wrong. This distinction pertained to the very structure of the cosmos. It held together the world of human relations. It was therefore immutable, irrefragable. It allowed of no exceptions, reservations, or repudiations. It could no more be suspended or diverted in its operations than the law of gravitation. It was final — like Thomas Carlyle’s “Everlasting Yea” and “Everlasting Nay,” which he described as “the deep, silent, rock-foundation” of reality.

The sources of this moral absolute were variously traced. Some found it in God, and the commandments of his holy will. Some thought of it as an intuition of the reason — the voice of conscience in the soul of man. Others sought and found it in history — in the lessons wrought out by man in his hard-won experience of fortune and misfortune. Still others identified it with the reign of law which prevails as universally and inexorably in the moral as in the material realm. Thus Wordsworth, in his “Ode to Duty,” defines the workings of the physical universe in moral terms when he declares that it is Duty which “dost preserve the stars from wrong.” In the same way Theodore Parker defines the workings of the moral universe in physical terms when he asserts that “the arc of the moral universe is long, but it bends toward justice.” But whatever the explanation, or interpretation, there still remains the absolute — the

values that do not change, the standards which do not shift. "Right is right, since God is God," the same yesterday, today, and forever. Hence the eternal challenge to man to do the right and to avoid the wrong. Not once merely, in some great crisis of human affairs, as Lowell tells us, but constantly, in every hour of passing, there comes

. . . to every man and nation the moment to decide,

In the strife 'twixt truth and falsehood, for the good or evil side.
And woe be unto that man or nation which does not decide aright, for inexorably there are parted

. . . the goats upon the left hand and the sheep upon the right,
And the choice goes by forever 'twixt that darkness and that light.

But all this is now gone. The absolute has yielded place in our time to the relative, the ideal to the real. It isn't a question any longer of what is right, for we do not believe in right and wrong as concrete aspects of reality. We do not recognize standards that hold from place to place, or values that endure from time to time, through all eternity. There are today only situations — and conduct which varies in relation to the character and impact of these situations. What is proper at one place and time may well be improper at another place and time. Like the play of a quarter-back in football, it all depends upon conditions. And since every condition in relation to a person, involves interests that are favorable or unfavorable to that person, it soon becomes clear that whatsoever action will serve our personal interests is naturally the action that we should take. So that conduct, from the relative point of view, tends steadily to degenerate until at last the only rule of life is to do what pleases us, profits us, prospers us. The final step in this descent into Avernus is to agree that anything is right that is expedient, or that we can get away with. And why not, if there is no universal and eternal principle by which in the end all things are judged? The prophet Amos, in his ancient day, used to talk about a plumb-line and how, if we would build our lives to stand, we must raise them true to this line held straight to the perpendicular by the pull of the universe itself. But this was long ago and far away. Why go to plumb-lines in Palestine for our instruction in America today?

I wish I had opportunity this evening to tell what this shift from absolutism to relativism in the field of morals has done to our age. It has brought upon us disasters which range all the way from the ruination of youthful lives to the corruption of cultures and the collapse of civilization. But my theme is preaching, and I must content myself with pointing out what a relativist philosophy of life has done, and is doing, to prophetic utterance. Is it not plain that it has stripped such utterance of its dignity, robbed it of its power, and denuded it of its authority? For in a universe of shifting standards, and no values at all, these qualities of great preaching are as debased as a paper currency without a gold reserve. If there is no absolute in the field of ethics then is a sermon nothing more or better than a corporation report discussing what may be profitable or unprofitable for the stockholders to do. A preacher if he can lay down no law of eternal right — what can he do but babble, like old Polonius, on

why day is day, night night, and time is time,
therewith accomplishing nothing
... but to waste night, day, and time.

The "Witness to Eternal Law"

Think of a pulpit which has no instant and final judgment upon adultery in the home, killing on the battle-field, or personal integrity in the intercourse of daily life. The pulpit had dignity, let me tell you, when it declared, "Abhor that which is evil, cleave to that which is good." The pulpit had power when it prophesied, "The wages of sin is death." The pulpit had authority when it dared to say, "Thus saith the Lord." Those were the great days of preaching — when, in the words of Theodore Parker, the preacher was concerned with "the truths of absolute religion." Daily he climbed Sinai, to receive afresh the tables of the law. Weekly, on the holy day, he mounted the pulpit, to proclaim the law that he had learned, and to affirm, "This do, and thou shalt live." This was a witness to eternal law which is the business of preaching — and it made great preaching. Nay, it did more! It transfigured commonplace preaching into something noble and sublime.

One more thought and I am done. I would refer, in clos-

ing, to humanism and its effect upon preaching, which I regard as unfortunate.

By humanism, let me hasten to say, I do not at this moment mean that quickening consciousness of the inner capacities of man's life which produces literature, nurtures culture, and has induced every flowering of intellectual and spiritual genius from the Age of Pericles to the period of the Renaissance. In this sense I boast myself a humanist, and my religion a humanistic faith. For I find religion rooted in human nature. It is a part of the experience of man upon this planet. To think of religion as supernatural, and thus as a miraculous bestowal from without, is to begin at the wrong end. If we are to know anything about religion we must start with man, and what he discovers within himself and develops out of himself, in his contacts with the infinite and eternal dimensions of the universe. But man is not the whole—only that part of the whole which we most surely know. In a thousand ways he reaches beyond himself to something higher implicit within himself. And this is God! I am a humanist, in other words, who finds no contradiction between humanism and theism, but sees rather in the one the fulfillment and completion of the other. God is the ultimate of man's experience. He is the logic of man's nature. He is the center from which every point of the circumference of reality is drawn.

The "Feeble Echo of Atheism"

No, the humanist I have in mind in this discussion of preaching is the doctrinaire who sets up his closed system of thought as a negation of God. He is the humanist whose ideas are a shabby, second-hand sample of the agnosticism of the nineteenth century. Worse still, he is the humanist whose denials are but a feeble echo of the atheism of ancient days. Beginning his religion with man he ends it at the same place, finding nothing beyond this creature, who lives a few years and dies forever, to kindle his imagination or extend his vision. Confusing superstition with faith he loses the latter with the swift passing of the former. Matthew Arnold, in his poem, *Dover Beach*, describes how

he heard in his time the "melancholy, long, withdrawing roar" of the Sea of Raith,

Retreating, to the breath
Of the night-wind, down the vast edges drear
And naked shingles of the world.

This is the landscape of the humanist as a kind of salvage-monger haunting these "naked shingles," all unmindful of the great ocean of eternal being which ebbs only in due time to flood back again from the exhaustless deeps of God.

Well, it is this type of humanist, the negating type, I have in mind when I speak of the unfortunate effects of humanism upon modern preaching. For how can there be any great preaching without God? What reservoirs of inspiration are there to be tapped if the life of man be cut off from the feeding well-springs of the divine? The preacher, says Phillips Brooks, is a messenger, "a courier who hurries in, breathless, to bring you a message." But what if he comes not from afar, and bears no message?

I was invited once to contribute some hymns to a humanist hymnal which was in course of preparation. I sent on the best I had. But I was told that my hymns were unacceptable because they apostrophized or made reference to God. The hymns in this hymnal were to be non-theistic. Whereupon I went through the classic hymnals of the church to find what would be left upon this basis of selection—and beyond a few didactic poems and a patriotic hymn or two, there was nothing. We must get along without "O God our help in ages past," "Lord of all being throned afar," and "A mighty fortress is our God."

Apply this standard to the Bible and what is left? In the Old Testament, *The Song of Songs*, most of *Ecclesiastes*, the book of *Proverbs*, the bloodthirsty book of *Esther*, and *Ruth* if you omit its noblest passage. The Psalms, the Prophets, the great historical books, all cast aside. In the New Testament, a few parables and episodes in the Gospels, and some brief moralistic passages from the Epistles. Nothing more. Is it any wonder that the Bible has disappeared from many of our humanist pulpits?

Or turn to English poetry, the greatest body of literary inspiration since "the glory that was Greece," and how

much of it is non-theistic? The early indiscretions of Shelley, the cynicism of Byron, the hedonism of Fitzgerald, the scepticism of Thomas Hardy, the pessimism of E. A. Housman, the decadence of Oscar Wilde—and what else? Chaucer, Spenser, Shakespeare, Dryden, Pope, Johnson, the metaphysical poets, Wordsworth, Coleridge, Keats, Tennyson, Browning, Emerson, Whitman, Lowell—all these ruled out! So little of the incalculable riches of English poetry at the disposal of the humanist! I tell you, his soul is going to run dry early, and the souls of those to whom he ministers will gasp for living water.

Can Preaching Recover Authority?

All this has to do with preaching—and a lot to do with it! For preaching, as I have reminded you, is the “communication of truth by man to men.” But what if truth be pared down to the bone? What if it be unclothed of its fair integument of the flesh? What if the channels of its life be choked up, and the sources of its strength be cut off? What if its inner light be extinguished, and there be darkness? What is the most gifted of preachers to do with such body of truth, which is more like a mummy than a living person? The impoverishment of language, if nothing more, is appalling. Think of preaching bereft of that pentecostal gift of tongues which comes, like “a sound from heaven as of a rushing mighty wind,” with the consciousness of God. Then there is the impoverishment of thought—the pedestrian ideas which are forever trying to lift themselves by their own bootstraps instead of with wings. How can there be far-flung thought which ranges not beyond the borders of man’s life? As for imagination, sublimation, exaltation—where are they, or whence do they come, apart from the contemplation of the divine? Humanism, such as I have described it, reduces everything to its lowest terms whereas it is the genius of religion, it seems to me, to raise everything to its highest terms. There can be no great preaching on these lowest terms. The language, the thought, the vision, the passion are all lacking. It is in this sense that humanism must be accounted a blight upon preach-

ing. The "accent of the Holy Ghost," to use Emerson's phrase, is not in it.

The age in which we live is obviously at fault. It is a materialistic age, profit-seeking, pleasure-loving, time-serving. Preaching is an intrusion upon such an age. It reminds people of what they would otherwise gladly forget.

There is fault also, and serious fault, in religion itself—in a faith which is appeasing these irreligious times, in a church which seeks nothing so much as to be worldly, in a pulpit which lacks confidence and self-respect. All too much of preaching these days is a feeble echo of newspaper editorials, magazine articles, and the latest ephemeral books. Why does it not speak, like John Alden, for itself—asking of life its own questions, and demanding its own replies?

Preaching, to recover its old power, must recover its old estate. The preacher, to recover his old influence, must recover his old authority. He must understand his errand as an ambassador of the Most High. When he stands in his pulpit, he must feel like Milton sitting at his desk. You remember how, when the great Puritan poet prepared to dictate the text of *Paradise Lost*, he invoked the aid of the "heavenly muse" to his "adventurous song,"

That with no middle flight intends to soar.

Then he lifted up his heart to the Holy Spirit

. . . that dost prefer

Before all temples the upright heart and pure

and he prayed for his poem, as the preacher should pray for his sermon:

Instruct me, for Thou know'st

What in me is dark

Illumine, what is low raise and support,

That, to the highth of this great argument,

I may assert Eternal Providence,

And justify the ways of God to men.

Industry's Social Responsibility

By HAROLD P. MARLEY

A minister sets down his personal reactions to the church's limitations, and to industry's vast opportunities, in activating the democratic process.

The Chamber of Commerce of Dayton, Ohio, has just announced an 18-point program for the year beginning May 1st. I studied the points carefully to see if there was anything which would fall into the category of social responsibility. There were points of civic responsibility: water, transportation, airports, economy; there were points on industrial responsibility: growth, interpretation, markets; but I did not see a single point on what I would call the social responsibility, or the person to person responsibility of industry.

The concept of social responsibility which I here present is that of having not only a better city and more efficient factories, but of having better people. You say, this is the job of religion. Yes, it is, but religion cannot do it alone. Let me illustrate. Religion can preach race tolerance and justice; it can even give tangible aid to Negro institutions; it can take Negroes into the church. But all it can do does not constitute the lift which comes to an individual who is allowed to advance in the factory just as far and fast as his qualifications justify. In other words, we cannot preach personality into people—they get it through believing in themselves and through seeing themselves progress in the community.

There has been much talk of the social responsibility of religion, and I believe in this. But I have also seen how difficult it is to translate our idealism into action. We do not employ people; we do not unlock doors for the ambitious; we do not have eight-hours-per-day contracts with people. It is my feeling that people not only need a job, but that if this job can be creative, they are getting much more out of it than their bread and butter. Industry therefore not only has an opportunity to build character, but a responsibility to do so. This is an industrial age, and if this age is to get around the personality-breakdowns which every clergyman is called

upon to treat almost every day in his rounds of the parish, it will do so as industry itself comes to the rescue. I do not mean that industry should make more money so we can build more churches and institutions. It should make less money so that we shall need fewer institutions. I am asking that industry itself become an institution in the best sense of that word—an organization in society for the enrichment of the lives of people. Not people in the abstract, but flesh-and-blood people who file by the time-clock.

Paternalism, "Not a Healthy Arrangement"

My argument is not for paternalism in industry. This was phase I of employer-employee relationship, in the days of small industries, small towns, and large opportunity for skilled handicraft. In the old Dayton, one would think of the Barney-Smith car works. Intimate personal contacts were soon lost with mass-production and large factories. They remain today only in some of the isolated mine and textile villages of the South. I have been in places where the industry takes entire social responsibility—the schools, the store, the recreation, housing, police and fire protection. Gentlemen, it is not a healthy arrangement. Not that there are no benevolent paternalists within this system. There are many of them; but they retire and their sons perforce cannot carry on in the same way. The main reason for their social lack however is that society is changing. The feudal system is breaking down, democracy is rising. You see, when I think of social responsibility in industry, I am thinking in terms of *all* of the parties within industry. Just as all workers in a given unit of industry have a responsibility to the production of a certain commodity—each making his particular skill count for what it is worth—so I think of each person as having a social responsibility to every other person. The learning process and the living process must go hand-in-hand with the production process—learning about prejudice, about social betterment, about cartels and organization.

I believe we are entering into a new industrial phase. I will call it phase III. Phase II is the one in which we now find ourselves—the stage in which industry dropped paternalism, dropped social responsibility, and addressed itself mainly to feverish research and more feverish production. Instead

of too much interference in politics there was not enough. Industry was *laissez faire*. It has been marked by two things which were inevitable as a result of the indifference which was nobody's fault in particular. One of these things was interference by the State. The forests could not be indiscriminately stripped, streams could not be polluted, gas could not be wasted in the petroleum fields, workers' health had to be protected. The other was the interference of labor which grew more articulate through organization. It asked for a slowing down of production lines and for a larger share of the profits of industry—two things which seemed contradictory. However, it was possible to slow down to a more physiologically sound pace and to get increased wages without seriously disturbing the production process. The public paid the bill.

We are leaving behind phase II because it was based on the principle of force and violence. Industry did not welcome state interference or union demands. The state was placed in the position of a policeman who was taking tax money from the pockets of industry on the one hand and breaking up picket lines of workers on the other hand. Industry became an armed camp with high fences and private armies of her own. Nobody was happy. Nobody gave much attention to the problem of social responsibility. There was conniving, there was the effort to control public opinion, there was fear—in community after community there was the very opposite of the things which make for social health and for religion. I know, because I saw the mask ripped from the Black Legion in Michigan; I sat in court for the trials; I interviewed some of its grand, exalted leaders in prison.

The War Brought Understanding

I believe we are entering phase III today, a closer union of all parties within industry, partly because of the war and partly because of the promulgation of the four freedoms. The war has united industry as never before. Where there is competition between factories, there is friendship. Workers and management alike take pride in the Navy or Army E which still flies above the factory gate. The four freedoms have brought women and Negroes into war plants—even little children have been placed in nurseries. There have been

fewer strikes as a result of dissatisfaction from below or pressure from on top. In fact, industry, providing the man at the front with materials to protect himself from the enemy, has become synonymous with social responsibility. For, during a war, all eyes were on the battlefield—even when that front was five thousand miles away. The war sped up changes which were long-delayed, technologically and socially.

Specifically, what do I mean by a closer union of all parties within industry? I mean more democracy, more common action as a result of common decision. I mean a changing of the psychology away from the master-servant basis, to one of equality. Equality in the social sense, in the Constitution sense, in the religious sense. I do not believe that all men in industry make equal contributions to the process of production and that they should therefore receive equal remuneration. However, given groups in a given industry are giving their lives to that particular job. Upon their doing so depends their home and their happiness. If they do not get home and garden and life-satisfaction out of it, where will they get them? All the rich uncles are dead. Even Uncle Sam, who is paying for wars past and present, cannot be expected to build factories for industries and houses for workers and give them away for less than they are worth. It is good economics that the elements of the good life must come out of industry—not only gadgets, but the satisfactions of the people within industry, office and shop.

Since I believe in a vital and close relationship of management and worker, I regret that at least one of the 18 points in Dayton's program should not have read something like this:

The organization within every Dayton factory of a Social Council to be made up of representatives of the various phases of industrial life, democratically elected. This Council to deal not only with productive matters, but also with group and personal problems which have to do with harmony within the factory, and peace and prosperity on the outside.

You see, this is only putting democracy into industry. It is making the production process a creative and valued part of a worker's experience. I believe it is wrong to have workers hurry away from the factory as though it were something

distasteful—something foreign to their living. I believe it is wrong to have industrialists hurry themselves into a fortune, sell out, and then turn to something which for them is more creative. Sinclair Lewis showed us this tendency in Dodsworth. If you do not believe in fiction, then consider Mr. Willys of Toledo, selling his plant and becoming ambassador to Poland, or Henry Ford wanting to be a senator and toying with the idea of being President. I believe in industry so thoroughly that I want to see it become something in itself—something vital and living, quite apart from what the blue-prints of production call for. I want it to accept its social responsibility.

The Creative Approach to Grievances

It can do this not through the publishing of a house paper filled with gossip. It can do it not through an occasional party or through teams in the industrial leagues. It must do it the hard way. At present the serious contacts between management and worker are over the question of contract and grievances which develop under the terms of that contract. It is necessary, but it is a negative stage. The creative approach is to aim for an atmosphere in which grievances do not develop. Often, there are personality problems which have nothing to do with a person as a manager or a worker at all. The problem is *that person*. If he is recalcitrant in the factory, he is recalcitrant at home. If he is so abnormal he will shoot a man who tells him that he is fired, he is the kind of person who would be dangerous anywhere. There may be a need for a psychiatrist as a full-time employee of the factory of the future. There may be need for a social worker who goes into the home and analyzes the family budget or child responsibility of parents. There may be need for credit unions to save interest, and to save homes. There may even be buying clubs. There will be many social functions performed by the factory in phase III, but what I am saying is that all these things will not come paternalistically from the top down—they must be part and parcel of the democratic process. They must be voted by the representatives of all, and must be paid for by all.

The beginning stages of Phase III will not see a lessening of manufacturer's associations or a lessening of unions.

Probably, rather, an increase in their power and effectiveness. For it is clear that the Committee for Economic Development and the national offices of the C.I.O.—and to a lesser degree the AFofL (mainly crafts)—are seeking to deal with specific and unique problems. I would like to point out, however, that the CIO has shown the way to the democratic enrichment of industry by making tremendous advances in the field of health and the education of its members. They get these benefits not as members of a lodge, but as members of an industry. It is a tribute to industry that it has produced these gains.

Eventually, after sufficient experience has accumulated, these various social-councils of the factories will have a central, delegated body where problems on a community basis will be handled. In the meantime there is nothing to prevent the Chamber of Commerce having a Standing Committee on Relations with the CIO Council. Nor is there any law against a particular factory manager setting up a Social Council in his plant to begin in a small way to get into the question of Negroes working beside Whites or any other issue which might arise, or anticipating it before its arrival.

My conclusion is that we have before us today something more than the Axis Powers, or the problem of full employment when the soldier returns home. We have before us the very gears of the four freedoms right within the wheels of industry. If the war is to be won on the home front the factory must be safe for democracy; and if there are not to be future wars, let us not rely too much upon the charter which has come from San Francisco. The peace pattern is right down within the factory gates and within the hearts of men. Shipping oil to Italy, planes to Germany and scrap-iron to Japan were contributing causes of the war. Such things went with phase II; and under phase II it was the worker alone who had developed a technique for stopping this evil at its source. He and a few liberals picketed the wharfs; his union of longshoremen refused in some instances to load the scrap iron which was ripping China into shreds. Under phase III, I believe, the germs of war will be destroyed before they can take root; I believe that the seeds of democracy will germinate into a mighty tree—a tree for the feeding of the nations.

The Social Conscience of a Church

By HOMER A. JACK

A Unitarian minister and social action executive records the struggle within his denomination to recapture, in the twentieth century, the unresting social conscience which inspired the founders and characterized the church in the nineteenth century.

Social evil can be accepted and controlled or attempts can be made to overcome it. Social action is the attempt to overcome social evil. It is social salvation. It is more than social service. It is more than social education in the usual meaning of the term. Social action may be attempted by groups acting independently of organized religion or by groups acting through the church. The former is secular social action and the latter is religious social action.

Religious social action takes place on two levels: the local church and the denomination. Whatever is done on the denominational level aids social action on the parish level, and whatever social action is attempted on a local, parish level helps social action on the denominational level. The interaction is almost complete. It must be borne in mind, however, that the end of social action is not the local church nor the denomination, nor both together. The goal of social action must be changed individuals *and* a changed society.

While the social element in the Judeo-Christian tradition is as old as the Hebrew prophets, Charles Howard Hopkins in *The Rise of the Social Gospel in American Protestantism* shows that denominational social action in America really got its start at the beginning of the twentieth century, with its roots easily traceable far back in the nineteenth. Several denominations have come forth with the claim for the earliest denominational social action. An Anglo-Catholic, Maurice Reckitt, says that the origins of the movement in America started with the Episcopal Church. Charles Howard Hopkins throws the honor to the Unitarians:

. . . . the inauguration in Boston in 1826 of a Unitarian "ministry at large" to the unchurched classes . . . initiated and carried on for a number of years by the Rev-

erent Joseph Tuckerman, was not only the first example of religious social service in America but was also the first serious effort on the part of a religious body to cope with the social and religious problems of the submerged population of a sizable city.

From these origins, denominational social action came into being with the social gospel movement. The social gospel was implemented, denominationally, by social action agencies, since the church was not organized for action. Within the first decade of this century, a number of denominations established these social action agencies. The evolution of church agencies for the purpose of social action—and for the purpose of meeting the needs of the socially sensitive individuals within all churches—took two forms: official agencies and unofficial agencies.

The "Privilege of Leadership"

The origins of official Unitarian denominational social action began with Dr. Samuel A. Eliot's presidential address before the American Unitarian Association in 1904. He asked:

. . . if the time had not come when it will be well for your association to add still new departments to its general endeavors. Has not the time come when these free churches of ours, acting through their National Association, may enter more directly and unitedly into tasks of education, of active charity, of social justice? . . . Unitarians as individuals have been the leaders of the American Commonwealth in all progressive reforms. Cannot the Unitarian body as a whole now assume that privilege of leadership which belongs to it by right of the labors and sacrifices of heroic men and women who have been trained in our principles?

In 1907 and in 1908 President Eliot repeated his request, and during the annual May meetings of the American Unitarian Association in 1908, the following motion was passed:

Resolved that the Association heartily approve the establishment of a Department of Social and Public Service, to the end that our churches may be assisted, individually and collectively, to take part in all endeavors for civic reform and social regeneration.

At that same meeting John Haynes Holmes introduced, on behalf of a committee, an important declaration of principles

concerning social questions. Dr. Samuel Crothers arose to voice the denomination-long fear: we "are heartily in favor of the spirit of this resolution, but [we] are in doubt as to anything introduced in a business meeting that seems to be a declaration of faith." Dr. Holmes replied:

. . . it is time for the Unitarian Church to stop putting with these questions of social reform and to put itself firmly on record as standing for something. . . . For a hundred years the Unitarian Church has led Christianity in America upon the side of theology, and I for one am dreaming of the day when the Unitarian Church of America shall lead the churches of this country upon the side of social reform.

The Unitarian Department of Social and Public Service began operations with the appointment of its secretary, Elmer D. Forbes, on October 1, 1908. The work of the department, which cannot be given in detail here, was divided into several areas: information, education, publication, legislation, organization, and cooperation. In 1917, the name of the Department was changed to that of the Department of Community Service. The secretary in his annual report said the old title was appropriate when the Department was organized nine years previously, but

. . . within this period of almost a decade the changes have been rung upon the phrase "social service" the world around until today it is worn and frayed and commonplace. Furthermore, there has always been a certain misunderstanding of the name. The secretary has frequently had to explain that the department had no connection with any political party and is not engaged in a propaganda of radical principles of social reform. Add to this the fact that the social function of the churches is much more sharply defined now than it was ten years ago and the reason is clear why the Department should receive a name which more perfectly describes the work for which it stands.

It is interesting to note, in this historical survey, the financial appropriations given to the Department of Social and Public Service and its successor during the decade or so of its existence. The highest annual appropriation for this work was \$4,400 in 1915-16. It is significant to compare the expenses of this Department with those of other departments of the Association and the total Association budget. Using the annual expenses of maintaining Unitarian headquarters

building as a yardstick, the amounts expended by the Department varied from thirty-one per cent in the first year of its existence to sixty-nine per cent of the building maintenance budget for 1914-15. In 1917-18, the Department spent only one and three-tenths per cent of the total budget of the denomination.

In the last report of the Department, which was for the fiscal year 1918-19, the secretary sounded the death-knell:

The first of May, 1918, found the churches in the thick of war work and giving little attention to any other forms of social service. When the Armistice was signed on November 11, so much still remained to be done that it was out of the question to suggest an immediate resumption of pre-war interests. . . . Furthermore, it does not seem expedient at this time to make very definite recommendations for future social work on the part of the churches, and this for two reasons. First, the different elements in the communities themselves have become accustomed to work together harmoniously to a degree unknown before the war. . . . With such a division of social interests it may seem that there is little reason for continuing the Department, but it still has important functions. . . . Its work is useful and necessary, but in these days of reconstruction both in society and in the churches it cannot wisely at this moment set forth a definite program of social work.

With this report, the Department passed out of existence and it was not until 1926 that the official Department of Social Relations was again established.

"Against All Forms of Social Injustice"

During the same annual May meetings of the American Unitarian Association in 1908, when the Department of Social and Public Service was born, Rev. Arthur L. Weatherly invited a number of ministers to assemble in Channing Hall at 25 Beacon Street. After much discussion it was unanimously voted to create a permanent organization to devote itself to the task of working for social justice. The name *Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice* was adopted. At a meeting on the following day the charter was agreed upon, and John Haynes Holmes was elected chairman. The object of the organization was "to provide a fellowship for united action against all forms of social injustice, and to sustain one

another in the application of our religious ideals to the needs of the day."

Less than six months after its establishment, the Fellowship apparently came into conflict with the official social action work of the denomination. An article in the December 10, 1908 issue of *The Christian Register* included these statements:

A word should be said concerning the supposed rivalry of the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice and the recently-organized Department of Social and Public Service of the American Unitarian Association. As a matter of fact, the two have distinctly different provinces and purposes. The work of the Social Service Department is to aid Unitarian churches in the adoption of wise methods to alleviate human misery and want and to minister to the needs of those who claim our sympathy and assistance. The Unitarian Fellowship is simply the getting together of those who desire to get at the root cause of this misery and want. It concerns itself not in the least with particular methods of humanitarian work, but with the economic and social principles, the operation of which has resulted in the need of such work. When this is properly understood, it will be seen that there is a very vital necessity for the Unitarian Fellowship just as there is the imperative duty of helping those who have been crushed down by the present social system in which we live.

It is impossible here to give all of the important details of the early history of the Fellowship. It should be stated, however, that a nation-wide speakers bureau was established and sectional social justice rallies were held. The Fellowship was attacked for not concerning itself more actively with the liquor question but President Holmes tactfully replied, "It is not good economics for the church to enter into a feverish competition with other splendid agencies for moral and social upbuilding of humanity."

At the second annual meeting of the Fellowship, a membership of 185 was announced, but there were complaints that this consisted too much of ministers. The preponderance of ministers however, probably helped to inaugurate a new phase of action, namely, investigations into the freedom of the pulpit. The secretary announced in 1910:

It is rumored that some of our ministers have suffered or have been discriminated against because of their advo-

cacy of some phase of social righteousness. The executive committee proposes to arrive at the facts in these cases and to create a sentiment hospitable to the prophetic voice, and to guarantee the perpetuity of a free pulpit as the most valued asset of religious progress.

From the beginning, the Fellowship engaged in a vigorous publication program. Not only did it make good use of the columns of the *Christian Register* and, indeed, sponsor a special column, but it issued its own leaflets: the social messages of Theodore Parker, Ralph Waldo Emerson, William Ellery Channing and others. From the beginning, too, the Fellowship held annual public meetings in Boston. The first two were well-attended. Rev. William Peck, Fellowship secretary, writes of the third meeting:

Rev. Samuel M. Crothers gave the principal address on "What is the Social Problem?" (We are still wondering) . . . This meeting was a mild and uneventful exhibition of skillful skating on thin ice without fracturing the ice. Evidently, the public anticipated it; for whereas our two previous rallies have been held before crowded houses, this was typically Unitarian. Bonnets galore and seats to spare.

"More Suited to a Secular Hall"

By 1913, however, the annual public meetings were effective enough to be feared, and the 1913 meeting was barred from the Arlington Street Church. Mr. E. S. Wiers gives the story in *The Christian Register*:

The Sunday night meeting of the Unitarian Fellowship for Social Justice has for all but one year of its history been held in the Arlington Street Church. Last year it was apparent to the officers of the Fellowship that the consent of the church was very reluctantly given. This year, when they again asked for the use of the church, they were told after weeks of delay and after being asked to submit their programme, that the programme submitted was more suited to a secular hall than to a church. [The program included talks on single tax, socialism, and woman suffrage]. . . . This entire matter shows that a real and great issue is at stake. There is little wonder that many of the men who feel the social impulse feel that there is no place within the Unitarian denomination for its expression.

Perhaps the most conspicuous work of the Fellowship in its formative years—as today—was the issuance of resolutions. Those resolutions covered a number of subjects, such as immigration policy, the use of a union label, “the Rockefeller interests,” racism in *The Birth of a Nation*, prohibition, and a number of other social subjects. There was deep concern within the Fellowship about the mounting possibility of war. In 1915, the Fellowship endorsed the Anti-Enlistment League (a “roll call of those of us who are prepared to serve our country by a refusal to engage in or endorse the murder called war”) and commended President Wilson on the way he handled the sinking of the *Lusitania*. In 1916, the Fellowship endorsed the principle of the League to Enforce the Peace, but urged the elimination of military force as an international sanction. In that year, also, it condemned the “preparedness” propaganda. In 1917, a referendum-resolution was sent to members of the Fellowship urging certain measures upon President Wilson to avert immediate war with Germany. The results of this referendum were indecisive and only about seventy persons in all responded. In that same year, however, resolutions were passed at the annual meeting against war as a means of settling disputes, against universal military training, and against the practice of exempting only members of certain religious bodies from military service. In 1918 the Fellowship deplored the action by the American Unitarian Association conditioning aid to churches on the vigorous support of the war by their ministers. Also in that year the Fellowship urged President Wilson to seek an early armistice. It is of interest to note some of the resolutions rejected by the Fellowship in this same period. These involved exporting munitions (1915), the control of the press (1915), the dangers of denomination endorsements (1915), and “the Mexican situation” (1916).

As the war had a lethal effect on the Unitarian Department of Social and Public Relations, it also was felt by the Fellowship. Activity on the part of the Fellowship waned. In 1917 it was recorded that the reports of the various Fellowship committees “disclosed the fact that very little had been done by any except the Executive Committee during the year.” In 1918, there was a proposal that the Fellow-

ship and the Free Religious Association merge, for, "unless the Fellowship would do something itself it had better come in and help the F.R.A. which is doing something." In 1919 activity had come to the point where the secretary wrote in the minutes, "probably for the first time in the history of the organization, no resolutions were presented or passed." While this is by no means a sign of organization senility (and indeed might be a sign of great wisdom), at the next annual meeting Mr. S. C. Beane brought up the question as to whether the Fellowship should be continued. After some discussion, "the sentiment expressed was for the continuation of the Fellowship." For the next half decade that sentiment for the continuance of the Fellowship was not very strong were one to judge by the empty pages of the secretary's record. In 1927 the question was raised on the Fellowship's being amalgamated with the newly-established Department of Social Relations of the American Unitarian Association. It was finally voted that the Fellowship continue as a separate organization, with a special committee of five to cooperate with the new department.

In conclusion, and if a historian may succumb to the temptation to make history as well as record it, it should be noted that the denomination is again faced, as it was in 1908, with the choice of strengthening both its official and unofficial social action agencies, or of refusing to do so, for whatever reasons. May I repeat John Haynes Holmes' dream of 1908: "For a hundred years the Unitarian Church has led Christianity in America upon the side of theology, and I for one am dreaming of the day when the Unitarian Church of America shall lead the churches of this country upon the side of social reform."

John Haynes Holmes—and indeed many of us—cannot afford to dream much longer. As this is America's last chance to make an enduring peace, so this may be Unitarianisms' last chance to make an enduring denominational social action program. Let us hope that future historians speaking before Unitarian Conferences will record 1945-1946 as the birth date of a new era of Unitarian denominational social action. If they do not because they cannot the date will be remembered in another way.

NEW SERVICE MATERIAL

How Should Services Begin?

By VINCENT SILLIMAN

The question is posed by one of my correspondents. The possibilities are numerous and diverse—too much so to be susceptible of discussion in a paragraph or two. Obviously there is no one usage to be preferred everywhere. You choose the kind of beginning that seems best, and design the further development of the service accordingly; better yet, you design your service as a whole, and then look for an appropriate way to begin it. In actual practice the situation is seldom if ever quite so simple.

It is worth noting that most medieval religious services began with psalmody — or at any rate had a period of psalmody toward the beginning. In other words a lyric mood was struck early in the service. Our custom is generally in accordance with this precedent — whether or not we are aware of the precedent. At the beginning our services generally include two or three lyric elements at least, such as: a doxology, a hymn, an anthem, the responsive reading of some ancient or modern psalm, an invocation lyrical in content.

Where the special emphasis of each religious service is determined by the ecclesiastical calendar, an early element in each service may be an "introit," a lyric and choral item which is supposed to announce the special emphasis of the service. The history of introits is long, and we may not go into that. No one would claim that the introits of the Roman Catholic and Lutheran Churches are often very exciting; though it is plain that the idea back of them has considerable validity. However, the dominant purposes of our church services are not for the most part determined by the ecclesiastical calendar.

Can we nevertheless have at or near the beginning of our services an item that will constitute an "incentive moment" with regard to the dominant purpose of the service? Can

the message of this item be clear enough to arrest the attention and arouse the expectancy of the people?

On the basis of my own experience with it let me commend a custom established in Hollis, New York, by the Rev. Dale DeWitt. He began each Sunday service with a poem or extract from a poem which suggested or anticipated the dominant purposes of the services. Such a beginning is doubtless unconventional, and I grant that it might be acceptable only in some of our less conventional churches. Even so, it is in accord with medieval precedents: the opening element is lyrical, and its purpose is to announce the special emphasis of the service. The poetry chosen must be characterized by both dignity and simplicity: it must be worthy of its high office and yet be easy enough to understand. Perhaps the worst drawback about this custom is its dependence upon the poetical taste and resources of the minister.

The Growing, Living World

We seek for our souls a wider room—its windows welcoming the sunlight, the breezes of heaven blowing through.

For man was made to grow; with open minds and open hearts we expand to the living and growing world.

Though kingdoms perish and cities crumble into dust, though words fall dead, like dry leaves shed from autumn trees,

The world is full of deathless things, and Beauty walks immortal on the earth;

Though the lore of all the centuries vanish like an unremembered dream,

Unwearied Truth continually beckons us toward glories yet unknown.

Out of the ashes of old hates, mistaken hopes, and deeds of darkness and of imperfection,

There rises ever the resplendent form of Goodness.

Let the unbelieving heart be put to shame, and let the mocking mouth fall still;

For, behold, the nature of Truth is to conquer, and the heart of Goodness is forever young.

Jacob Trapp

Let Man Worship

Let man worship with his eyes and his ears and his fingertips; let man learn to love the world through his heart-mind-body.

He must feel the rushing of the wind and the pouring of the sun gather him together with blessing and with comfort.

The colors flowing in the field and sky, light over eyes, over faces: the windy colors and the colors of warm, tideless gardens must heal his spirit and feed his hunger.

The lifting sounds of trees and grasses, the noises of man and woman eddying and gathering into a song of human togetherness: the purity of birds singing, the music of throat and brass and wood:

These must be friendly and golden to the ear lonely for beauty.

Let man feast his eyes upon the mystery and revelation in the faces of his brothers and sisters; let him know the wistfulness of the very young and the very old, the wistfulness of men in all times of life.

Let him see the shyness behind arrogance, the clumsy strength, the anguish behind cruelty.

Let him live in a thousand lives as he walks in the crowds of men; let him live in a hundred houses as he walks through the city;

And let him know that all lives flow into a great, common life, if he will only open himself to his companions.

Let him listen to the secret voices of poetry, and learn that all men share his yearning: that all are lonely as he is lonely, and that all men need the sure presence of those who love and are loved.

Let man worship, not in bowing down, not in closed eyes and stopped ears:

Let man worship with the opening of all the windows of his being, with the full outstretching of his spirit.

Life comes with singing and with laughter, with tears and confiding, with a rising wave too great to be held in the heart-mind-body, to those who have fallen in love with life.

Let man worship, and let man learn to love.

Kenneth L. Patton

Benedictions

May we walk as children of the light, an upward way. May we have joy in the fellowships of the way, and lend a helping hand when the footing is rough. May we have the wisdom that comes of a broad prospect, and good hope because the goal is clear. Amen.

The God of all the good of past and present, the God of all the good we can conceive and more, bless us and comfort us, guide us and give us strength and courage, now and always. Amen.

Sherwood N. Brown

Grace Before Meat

For all the good things that nourish and sustain our lives, we give thee thanks, O God; but most earnestly for the honor of thy spirit. Make us good stewards.

Waitstill Hastings Sharp

The editors of the JOURNAL OF LIBERAL RELIGION renew their invitation to all their readers—regular and transient—to give creative utterance to the faith that lifts and moves them. On these pages we seek to make available to free churches everywhere, modes and forms of religious expression which will serve our contemporary needs as adequately as the ancient forms served the needs of the times and conditions which produced them. We cannot promise to publish all the materials we receive; we do promise to read every contribution with eagerness and with high hope, and to publish all those which seem to justify a wider distribution.

BOOKS

Preaching Set to Music

HELLO, MAN. By Kenneth L. Patton. Madison, Wisconsin: Published by the author. 114 pp. \$1.00.

Kenneth Patton has not written a book of prose, nor is it exactly poetry. He has bared his soul. He has given in verse form, the record of what happens to a liberal minister who is sensitive to the agitation of life about him and within him. To use his own words, "A man is many wires strung in the wind, and he must sing the song of the air that flows over him."

Hello, Man is strong doctrine, cutting deep into the naturalistic setting in which man finds himself. It is humanism on fire. It is erudite, but not bookish; sacred, but not ministerial. Here is man speaking to man—a man who has lived fully and studied hard, but who is not stumped either by the naked aspects of living or the philosophies which dress them up. He is singing the modern lay of a minstrel who sees in life *today* its sufficient justification.

As to style, one immediately thinks of Walt Whitman, or of Kahlil Gibran. There is phraseology of both the Old and New Testaments. But the verve is definitely original, and the verses on *The Love of Man* would seem to be a useful conversion of the 13th Chapter of 1st Corinthians. The one danger of the book is that Patton has used words with too great prodigality. They run from his pen like pellets. One is sometimes benumbed. The author recognizes the difficulty of the medium of words when he says that "words are blind men on crutches," but he should beware of converting the crutch into a bow and arrow for the man who cannot see.

Basically, we have here the dialectics of nature, with stars and man, cradle and grave in constant juxtaposition. We have a record of supra-naturalism and infra-theism which is refreshing and superbly conceived. The verses on *The Man Jesus* are excellent, and make one wish that there were more historic imagery and an occasional factory whistle along with the earth, air and water. The high point may be said to be the section on *The Spirit of Man*, where we read that "The spirit of man is as hardness is to stone, as odor and color are to the things of earth." The book is the answer to the question so often raised, "Can humanism be beautiful as well as true?" It is a great affirmation of humanism as the religion of the modern man, with emotions springing naturally and fruitfully out of the hard flint of the rationalism of this age of science. Patton gives a forthright fulfillment to the challenge he himself raises, "Be man

enough to carry the burdens that you have heaped upon your own shoulders."

I don't like the title of the book (*Man Amid the Stars*, might be better) and many of the captions could be improved for accuracy. It would have been better had the printer used a deckle edge on the binding and had put the table of contents in the front, instead of last as an index. It would have been appropriate had the publishing department of the Unitarian church jumped at the chance to put into print this great contribution of a Unitarian minister, for here is virile preaching set to music, and liberalism made whole.

Harold P. Marley.

The Philosopher of Human Culture

AN ESSAY ON MAN. By Ernst Cassirer. New Haven: Yale University Press. 237 pp. \$3.00.

Ernst Cassirer is slated for early inclusion in that distinguished group of philosophers whose contributions to human thought are being analyzed and assessed by their contemporaries in "The Library of Living Philosophers." Dewey, Santayana, Whitehead, E. G. Moore and Bertrand Russell have already been included. Cassirer and Croce will be sixth and seventh in the circle. The present book, his first in the English language, is persuasively and charmingly written. It will give many American readers their first opportunity to be lifted and moved by his far-ranging mind and his deep insights.

If any living thinker deserves in a special sense to be called *The Philosopher of Human Culture* it is Cassirer. He has studied and taught in both the old world and the new; he has concerned himself with the ancient origins of human life as well as with its present tensions and conflicts, and he has probed deeply into the biological as well as the physical aspects of the universe. Moreover, it is because of, rather than in spite of, his coming to grips with the hard realities of the sciences that he has learned to place so high an estimate on the significance of the arts as instruments in the hands of man to possess the earth.

At times Cassirer reminds one of Whitehead. There is in him a constant awareness of the cosmic setting and historic sweep within which human problems must be understood and worked out. Religion and science, history, language and the arts cannot be understood at all except in terms of their involvement with the cosmic whole and with each other, and their development through recorded history. "We cannot conceive any real thing except under the conditions of space and time."

One is also reminded of Bergson. Cassirer is never more fascinating than when he speaks of the dynamic qualities of existence, the inexhaustible resources of life providing as they do, and constantly, a veritable stream of unpredictable developments. His

interest in biology, however, is not—as it was with Bergson—a predominant interest. Cassirer has made nothing less than civilization—including, of course, the sciences and the arts, history, language, mathematics and all the other major areas of human interest—the object of his understanding and his concern. Such a study sees man as the focal point upon which the creative process has lavished its richest and most varied gifts. The continuing evolutionary process—from the inorganic to the organic, from the simple to the complex, from sub-human to human levels—needs first to be recognized. What we now have on our hands, however, is a being clearly distinguishable from others by his awareness of space and time, by his developed use of language, symbols and myths, and by his ability to remember the past and to project himself in his imagination into the future. Thus it has come about that man, by his own achievement, lives “no longer in a merely physical universe. . .” He lives, also, “in a symbolic universe.” For:

Language, myth, art and religion are parts of this universe. They are the varied threads which weave the symbolic net, the tangled web of human experience.

Such a statement, removed from its context, is subject to misunderstanding. Cassirer does not impose his philosophy of symbolism upon the world of everyday experience; he finds it in that world. Language, he observes, is a vast and complicated system of symbolism. It unites people by helping them understand each other; it divides them by creating new occasions of misunderstanding. Human knowledge is by its very nature symbolic knowledge; and whereas mathematics is the purest example, it is impossible to be strictly factual in any of the sciences. Only by means of the generous use of symbols can the realities of life be understood and communicated.

All of this is equivalent to saying that our knowledge of the world must, in the nature of the case, be partial and imperfect knowledge; and history is at this point our shining example. None of the facts of history are recoverable. Ideal reconstruction, not empirical observation, is the first step in historical knowledge. The historian needs all the facts he can assemble, and to these he must bring insight, sympathetic imagination, symbolism. In no other way can he interpret the past or sketch the prospect of our future.

Cassirer thus surveys man's halting and precarious effort to understand himself and to make his adjustment to his world. Human culture he describes as “the process of man's progressive self-liberation.” He continues:

Language, art, religion, science, are various phases in this process. In all of them man discovers and proves a new power — the power to build up a world of his own. . . . Philosophy does not overlook the tensions and frictions, the strong contrasts and deep conflicts between the various powers of man. These cannot be reduced to a common denominator. They tend in different directions and obey different

principles. But this multiplicity and disparateness does not denote discord or disharmony. All these functions complete and complement one another. Each one opens a new horizon and shows us a new aspect of humanity. . . . The contraries are not mutually exclusive, but interdependent: 'harmony in contrariety, as in the case of the bow and the lyre.'

An approach such as this, to the problems of man and his universe, suggests a pattern of thought in which high religion can find clear and effective expression. And because it is so profoundly anthropological it should be required reading for all those who in the name of religion have lost their faith in man.

Edwin T. Buehrer

A Challenge to Liberals

THE ROAD TO SERFDOM. By Frederick A. Hayek. Chicago: University of Chicago Press. 250 pp. \$2.75.

By the author's own confession this is frankly a political book. The author has digressed from his own (to him) more important work to express his views because he thinks economists either have been too busy, or their lips are sealed by their official positions, to offer intelligent guidance to public opinion and that therefore opinion is too much influenced by amateurs and cranks, and by those who have "an axe to grind or a panacea to sell."

The thesis of this book is that England and America are far gone on the "road to serfdom," that we are drifting blindly and shamefully down a trail that spells the end of our true freedom if we do not change our course. The argument is that we have abdicated from too many of our responsibilities as citizens and have been taken in by a social philosophy which says that if anything can be done about things the government has to do it. The basis of the argument is largely historical analogy, specifically Austria and Germany.

Perhaps Professor Hayek has really put his finger on a weakness that is characteristic of certain aspects of Western civilization; a rather strong tendency to "let George do it." He feels that freedom is being destroyed today in England and the United States by the same forces, just as it was destroyed in the fascist nations, and that the nature of the dangers are even less understood today in these countries than they were in the fascist countries. He lays considerable emphasis on demonstrating that nazism and fascism were not reactions to socialist trends, but grew out of the increasing power of the state which characterized these trends.

Professor Hayek opposes economic "planning" wherever such planning would, or does, result in the destruction of individual freedom. This freedom he defines as respect for man as a man, and as an environment which accepts the desirability of each man developing according to his own individual gifts or bents. He states

as a fundamental principle of liberalism "that in the ordering of our affairs we should make as much as possible of the spontaneous forces of society, and resort as little as possible to coercion . . ."

Professor Hayek has written here a powerful case against the philosophy of "planning" which he sees as inherent in our present drift. He does not oppose "planning" per se. For him the criterion is whether the planning fosters and increases competition and freedom, or results in a destruction of these values.

Space does not permit a critical appraisal of the work, but this reviewer feels that the wrong people are reading the book. Conservatives are finding a solace not warranted by the author's thinking; more liberals need to read the work and think through the challenges with which Professor Hayek has confronted them.

Walter B. Garver.

Tradition: "Central" and "Untouchable"

THE THRILL OF TRADITION. By James Moffatt. New York: The Macmillan Company. 201 pp. \$2.00.

This book would have been more accurately titled if it had been called "*The Thrill of The Tradition.*" While it recognizes, in part, the deadening effects of one-hundred-percent traditionalism, it is generally a traditionalist's plea for unquestioning acceptance of the traditions of the theological Christ.

There is some resemblance between this book and a recent magazine article which was entitled, "*Religion Made New.*" The titles said one thing and the article said another. The article said that we must renew our loyalty to the old Christian beliefs, doctrines and practices, the author's contention being that religion would be made new when religion was made old.

Dr. Moffatt's theme is essentially that. He does pay some respects but he makes clear that this applies only to the peripheral traditions, and never to the central, untouchable tradition of the Christ. He calls attention to a change in the Te Deum of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States: "Thou didst not abhor the Virgin's womb" has been changed to read, "Thou didst humble thyself to be born of a Virgin." This, we are assured, "may be ranked as a legitimate exercise of flexibility in preserving a classical form." The word juggling in this particular chapter reminds us of the Irishman's definition of a net. "A net," he said, "is a lot of holes tied together with strings."

The significance of this book for religious liberals is suggested by two sentences. "It was the influence of Maurice to which the editor of the Spectator owed his soul. He soon passed from an unsatisfying unitarianism into the rich catholicism of the English Church, and the relief was primarily due to the manner in which

traditional phrases of the liturgy were invested with spiritual reality."

Nonetheless, it would probably be a good tonic for religious liberals to read *The Thrill of Tradition*. It will not thrill them greatly but it will acquaint them with the language and methods of one of the leading apologists for traditionalism. They will derive more profit out of the last half of the book, for there the author admits that traditions are poor substitutes for truth when traditions become nothing more than trademarks or conventions.

Delos O'Brian

The Story of Social Progress

SOCIAL-ECONOMIC MOVEMENTS. By Harry W. Laidler. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell. 828 pp. \$5.00.

We religious liberals are fond of saying that revelation is not sealed, that the minister (and layman) dips into works, *anciens* and modern, as well as *The Holy Bible*. And of course we do—*Great Companions*, Channing's *Works*, and perhaps Upton Sinclair's *Cry for Justice* are at our elbow, plus some well-worn, concise European *History* left in the parsonage by the fast-retreating predecessor.

All this is by way of urging that Harry Laidler's *Social-Economic Movements* should take its place in the middle of our revelation shelf, somewhere between the *Abingdon Bible Commentary* and the *Bhagavad-Gita*. Now don't expect a sheaf of socio-economic readings. There aren't any. Instead you will find revelation in the raw, in the form of a comprehensive, readable picture of such schools of social thought as utopian, Marxist, Fabian, syndicalist, guildist, communist, cooperative, Christian socialist, and state socialist. The book runs the gamut from Amos to Browder (in his "Teheran" phase), replete with extensive bibliographies and plates of photogenic "doers" from Sir Thomas More to Harold Laski.

Religious liberals will especially note accounts of Channing's sympathy for the Associationists, of George Ripley's resignation from the Unitarian ministry to establish Brook Farm, and—at the other end of the book—of a valuable treatment of Christian socialism from De Lamennais to Reinhold Niebuhr (in his rare beyond-New Deal moments).

A valuable part of the book is a balanced (and fortunately not typically socialist) criticism of "communist principles and tactics." There is also an encyclopedic survey of socialist movements in many lands—including Germany, Italy, Japan, and Argentina. The paranoecium-like divisions of the American socialist movement are also catalogued, and no reader will ever again confuse a DeLeonite with a Lovestonite. Most stimulating is a section on "recent socialist thought," which includes the rethinking *thinking* socialists have been doing on such diverse problems as the role of management, incentives in a socialized society, and the democratization of bureaucracy.

Harry W. Laidler, the author of this volume, is the long-time executive director of the League for Industrial Democracy, the L.I.D.. He has a facility for collecting materials which have been too largely confined to the weekly, left-wing journals. This book is one in a social science series edited by Professor Seba Eldridge of the University of Kansas—a member of the Unitarian Society of Lawrence, and another of those Unitarians who never come to church. Yet if he spent his Sunday mornings editing this compendium, I know he will not be judged too harshly.

Homer A. Jack

Service, Worship or Ceremony?

CHARLES H. HEIMSATH. *The Genius of Public Worship*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 204 pp. \$2.50.

Here are twenty-two brief chapters of informal comment upon various aspects of public worship, by a Baptist minister who admires the thinking of Von Ogden Vogt in this field.

The point of view is common sense rather than either the philosophy or the history of worship. Memorable sentences are scattered through the book: "There is no such thing as an informal religious service." "The highest service religion can make to justice and peace is to lift them to the level of worship. . . ." "To leave people to the single restraint of the emancipated mind and the enlightened conscience is admittedly at once the most daring, costly and splendid of all spiritual adventures." An occasional brush with theory is entertaining—for example, this: "So far as I can make out, religious music is for Professor Davidson . . . something that only God can fully understand or enjoy."

Though the author has read widely and observed sympathetically the book is not to be depended on for factual accuracy. The misspelling of Professor Davison's name is a minor instance. The "plain rostrum" of a Georgian meeting-house is spoken of. So far as I know, no Georgian meeting-house ever had a rostrum save as a later innovation: a huge, high, rather ornate pulpit was the rule. Again, "Gothic architecture naturally enough came in with Anglican and Catholic groups." Before the Gothic revival Anglicans here and in England built "Georgian" churches. Catholics abandoned the Gothic style for centuries. Again, the author says "there were a few Greek and a considerable number of Latin hymns (including *Adeste Fideles*), but hymn singing became a powerful movement in religion with Luther. . . ." The original text of *Adeste Fideles*, though Latin, is probably later than that of Luther's hymns.

If this book has a single thesis, it is that the genius of the church resides in its public ceremonial. The thesis is significant and well supported, though the author uses the word "ceremonial" where other words would carry his meaning better.

Vincent B. Silliman

Antidote to Hayek

BIG DEMOCRACY. By Paul H. Appleby. New York: Alfred Knopf and Company. 196 pp. \$2.50.

"Assuming that government is inevitably going to have more responsibility and power, what are the means by which that power may be exercised in a way acceptable to Americans?" The question, thus put, states the author's problem.

Much popular discussion of this subject is based upon a rather profound ignorance of what government is, what its functions and responsibilities are, and how it actually works today. Mr. Appleby has been an editor and was for twelve years an assistant to Mr. Henry Wallace in the Department of Agriculture. He has now returned to business as the manager of a broadcasting company. He is definitely a liberal in his viewpoint, and brings to his book both experience and common sense. The book's usefulness is indicated by the fact that it has already been adopted as a reference for several university political science departments. If now it could become required reading for all those who say, on the one hand, "Why can't the government do it?", or on the other hand, "Down with bureaucracy," popular opinion would reflect more light and less heat.

For ministers, the book has several incidental values—chapters on "Administrative Leadership," "Working With People," and "Red Tape," for example — for the basic principles of democratic responsibility apply no less to the local church than to the vast governmental departments. Finally, I suggest that this book be put in the hands of all those who find themselves carried away by Hayek's *Road to Serfdom*.

Josiah R. Bartlett.

Introducing Our Contributors

With this issue we feature two addresses which were given before large and distinguished audiences on the occasion of the centennial celebration at the Meadville Theological School, a member of the federation of theological schools at the University of Chicago. *Religion and the Whole of Life* is the inaugural address given by the new president, WALLACE W. ROBBINS . . . JOHN HAYNES HOLMES' baccalaureate address, *Preaching and Religion Today*, is hereby reprinted in slightly abbreviated form . . . F. H. AMPHLETT MICKLEWRIGHT reports from London and England. He is the author of numerous articles in English and American journals. His most recent book, *Rationalism and Culture*, was published last year. . . . HAROLD P. MARLEY, a Unitarian minister in Dayton, Ohio, has long been a student of, and a participant in, the social struggle . . . HOMER A. JACK is the Executive Secretary of the Council Against Racial and Religious Discrimination, in Chicago . . . WALTER B. GARVER is an Agricultural Economist for the Federal Reserve Bank in Chicago . . . DELOS O'BRIAN is the Unitarian minister at Wilmington, Delaware. He is also a newspaper columnist and an author . . . JOSIAH R. BARTLETT serves the Unitarian Church at Seattle, Washington . . . JACOB TRAPP is the minister of the Community Church in Summit, New Jersey. He is the author of the widely known and frequently sung hymn, *Wonders Still the World Shall Witness* . . . KENNETH PATTON, whose new book of poetry *Hello, Man*, is being reviewed in this issue, is a Unitarian minister and radio preacher in Madison, Wisconsin . . . WAITSILL HASTINGS SHARP, a minister formerly associated with UNRRA is now in Czechoslovakia with The American Society for Relief.

The Journal of

LIBERAL RELIGION

PUBLISHED quarterly by the
Unitarian Ministerial Union,
with the cooperation of the Uni-
versalist Ministerial Union and
The Meadville Theological
School.

To encourage creative, scholarly writing by religious liberals.

General Editor
EDWIN T. BUEHRER

Editor, Service Materials
VINCENT B. SILLIMAN

Meadville Editor
WALLACE W. ROBBINS
Treasurer.....

Associate Editors
RALPH E. BAILEY AND HARMON M. GEHR
HERBERT E. CLAPMAN

Editorial Counsellors

JAMES LUTHER ADAMS	THADDEUS B. CLARK	DELOS W. O'BRIAN
JOSEPH BARTH	J. RAYMOND COPE	KENNETH L. PATTON
JOSIAH R. BARTLETT	DALE DEWITT	CURTIS W. REESE
ERNEST CALDECOTT	DANA MCLEAN GREELEY	ALFRED STIERNOTTE
KARL M. C. CHWOROWSKY	RANDALL S. HILTON	ALEXANDER P. WINSTON

CORRESPONDENCE should be directed to the editor at 301 North Mayfield Avenue, Chicago 44, Illinois. Subscriptions should be sent to the same address. The subscription rate is *one dollar per year*.

ALL contributions submitted to the editor should be accompanied by suitable return envelope and sufficient postage. Manuscripts cannot be returned unless this formality is observed.

**THE
HUMANIST**
Vol. V, No. 2

QUARTERLY

\$1.00 a year
25c the copy

<i>Churches, Synagogues—And Yet This Tragedy</i>	A. E. HAYDON
<i>Greatest Hoax in History</i>	J. H. HYND
<i>Guilt and Atonement: German Post-war Attitudes</i>	C. J. FRIEDRICH
<i>Peacetime Conscription: Goodbye Democracy</i>	M. C. OTTO
<i>India and World Peace</i>	M. N. CHATTERJEE
<i>Fields of Action for Humanists</i>	PRYNS HOPKINS
<i>Rationalism Versus Rockefeller</i>	CYRUS EATON
<i>High School Credit for Religion? No!</i>	E. H. WILSON

OFFER. Year's Subscription and CARL FRIEDRICH's *New Belief in the Common Man* (paper edition). Both \$2.17 postpaid.

AMERICAN HUMANIST ASSOCIATION
1201 Union St. Schenectady 8, N. Y.

COMING IN THE AUTUMN ISSUE OF
The Journal of
LIBERAL RELIGION

A Stirring Article,

**THE READER'S DIGEST — DOES IT PROMOTE
PEACE AND SECURITY?**

By HELEN RAND MILLER

Mrs. Miller has devoted many months to a critical study of the policies of the editors of Reader's Digest, as revealed by the most incontrovertible evidence available, the monthly issue of that journal. Their handling of the problems that make for and against the encroachments of fascism will be competently scrutinized in Mrs. Miller's forthcoming article.

Place your subscription early, and your order for extra copies of the Autumn issue, to be published in October. Single copies twenty-five cents plus postage; quantities of ten or more at fifteen cents each, postpaid.

The Journal of LIBERAL RELIGION, 301 North Mayfield Ave., Chicago 44.
